



*shew*

*Toronto University Library*

*Presented by*

*University of Oxford*

*through the Committee formed in*

*The Old Country*

*to aid in replacing the loss caused by*

*The disastrous Fire of February the 14<sup>th</sup> 1890*









*RTheol*  
W

# THE HISTORY OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

*LIBRARY*

BY

WILLIAM WALL, M.A.

VICAR OF SHOREHAM, KENT, AND OF MILTON NEXT GRAVESEND.

TOGETHER WITH

MR. GALE'S REFLECTIONS,

AND

DR. WALL'S DEFENCE.

---

EDITED, BY

THE REV. HENRY COTTON, D.C.L.

LATE STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH.

---

IN TWO VOLUMES.

*2 vol.*

VOL. I.

---

OXFORD;

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MDCCCLXII.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



# ADVERTISEMENT

BY THE EDITOR.

---

IN offering to the public this edition of Dr. Wall's works on Infant-baptism, accompanied by the treatise of his antagonist Mr. Gale, it appears desirable to premise some few observations respecting these two authors; especially such as may throw light upon the publications which are here reprinted.

Of Dr. WALL's personal history the materials are very scanty; and little pains appear to have been taken towards preserving them, at a period when such information could readily have been obtained.

No life of him is given in the *Biographia Britannica*. And the account which Mr. Chalmers has inserted in his more recent 'Biographical Dictionary,' is extremely barren of details, and in some few points incorrect.

It appears, from his own statement in the opening of the Defence, vol. ii. p. 359, that he was born about the year 1646. The Diploma of his D. D. Degree describes him as some time of Queen's College, M.A. And the following entry in the University Register of Matriculations may, accordingly, be accepted as evidence of the place of his birth: 'Coll. Regin. April. 1, 1664. Guil. Wall an. n. 17, fil. Guil. W. de Sevenoke Cant. pl.'

About the year 1676 he was presented to the living of Shoreham in Kent; a vicarage in the diocese of Rochester, in the gift of the dean and chapter of Westminster.

Here he resided, in the faithful discharge of his pastoral duties, during the long space of fifty-three years. It is said that he once declined the offer of a second benefice (Chelsfield), of the value of three hundred pounds a year, from conscientious motives, although it was situate within three miles of Shoreham; but subsequently he accepted one, of about one fifth of that value, namely Milton near Gravesend, at the distance of twelve miles from his residence<sup>a</sup>.

In 1676, or 1677, he married Catharine, daughter of Edward

<sup>a</sup> The duty of this parish was discharged by a curate, the Rev. Mr. Thomas; of whom his rector speaks in high terms, particularly 'as helping him

'much in bringing the people to a conformity in the office of baptism, and other things.' (See *Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. iii. p. 365.)

Davenant, esq. by whom he had two sons, William and Thomas, both of whom became citizens of London, but died before their father: also two daughters, who died in their infancy; and a third, Catharine, married to Mr. Waring of Rochester, by whom he left sixteen grandchildren, eight sons and eight daughters.

After a long life, silently but honourably passed in professional studies, and the duties of his sacred calling, Dr. Wall expired, on the 13th of January, 172 $\frac{7}{8}$ , at the age of 82. He lies buried in the north aisle of Shoreham church; and over his grave is a marble slab, with a brass plate bearing the following inscription: ‘ Hic  
‘ situm est corpus Wilhelmi Wall; in quem ob scripta ab eo edita  
‘ Academia Oxon. gradum Doctoris in Theologia sponte contulit.  
‘ Qui decessit 13 die Januarii anno D. 1727, ætatis suæ 82; post-  
‘ quam animarum populi hujus curam vicarius gesserat per annos  
‘ 53. Item et populi sui de Milton rector per annos fere 20.

‘ Prope autem jacet uxor ejus Catharina, filia Edwardi Davenant  
‘ generosi, quæ decesserat 10 die Maii A.D. 1706, ætatis 48. Filius  
‘ etiam Thomas, civis Londinensis, qui obierat 30 die Januarii 1709,  
‘ ætat. 25. Duæ etiam filiæ infantulæ, Elizabetha et Rebecca. Filius  
‘ etiam Wilhelmus, civis Londinensis, qui decessit 15 die Junii,  
‘ anno D. 1725, ætat. 46.’

This inscription was printed sixty-five years ago, in Thorpe’s ‘ Registrum Roffense;’ and has been recently verified for me by the kindness of a reverend friend on the spot.

It appears from a passage in Dr. Wall’s first volume, that his thoughts were originally turned to a deep consideration of the question of infant-baptism, by the circumstance of the part of England where he resided containing a large number of baptists. After perusing the publications of their chief advocates, he was so satisfied of the insufficiency of the arguments put forth in defence of *adult-baptism* as the only true form; and so moved by the hardy and unsupported assertions of Mr. Danvers; that he determined to sift the whole question from the beginning; to search in ancient authors, ‘ how the first Christians did practise in this matter;’ and to give the result of his researches to the world.

At what period this resolution was first formed, we have no means of knowing; but from the slow and cautious habit which seems to have been his characteristic, as well as from his own expression, that he ‘ had for some years made it his business to ‘ observe,’ &c. it may be presumed that he spent *several* years in collecting his materials, before he ventured to submit them to the public eye.



The 'History of Infant-baptism' was first published in 1705, in two octavo volumes. It immediately attracted considerable notice; and obtained for its author most honourable testimonies of approbation. The clergy of the lower house assembled in Convocation passed a vote, 'That the thanks of this house be given to Mr. Wall, 'for the *learned and excellent book* he hath lately written concerning 'infant-baptism.' And bishop Atterbury hesitated not to affirm, that 'it was a book for which the author deserved the thanks, not 'of the *English* clergy alone, but of *all Christian churches*.'

The attention of foreigners was directed to it, by a review contained in the periodical publication entitled, 'Nouvelles de la 'république des Lettres,' conducted by M. Jacques Bernard, at Amsterdam.

Of the spirit of that review Dr. Wall thus speaks: 'Upon the 'whole, I take M. Bernard's remarks on my book to be such as 'become a learned and also a civil and friendly writer. As for the 'difference of opinion concerning some points of less moment in 'religion, it will always happen.'

But objections having been made to a passage or two in the work, as conveying personal imputations; and farther consideration having induced the author to alter some and strengthen others of his arguments, he put forth in 1707 his *second edition*, 'with large 'additions,' in quarto; in the preface to which he defended himself at large against the insinuations which had been thrown out.

M. Bernard ('Nouvelles,' &c. 1708. p. 592) informs us, that Dr. Wall had published a small piece, of 45 octavo pages, containing the alterations, additions, and corrections, which he made in his second edition. This little tract I have never met with. It is briefly mentioned by the author, in his 'Defence,' p. 110.

Previously to the appearance of his second edition, Dr. Wall, either at the suggestion of friends, or from his own feeling of the usefulness of such a tract, published a compendious abridgment of his larger work, in the form of a Dialogue between a supporter and an opponent of infant-baptism; in which he insists chiefly and almost exclusively on the arguments derived from *Scripture*, as best suited to the capacity and studies of unlearned readers.

The title of this piece is, 'A Conference between two men that 'had doubts about Infant-baptism. By W. Wall, vicar of Shoreham in Kent.' 12°. London, 1706; (containing 83 pages, price 4d. or 25s. per hundred.) A *second edition* of this appeared in 1708, 12°. And we may judge of its extensive popularity, from the author's remark to Mr. Gale, that upwards of four thousand copies

had been circulated before his 'Reflections' were published (in 1711). A *sixth* edition of it was printed in 1795, for the society for promoting Christian knowledge: a *seventh*, for the same society, in 1801: and a *ninth* in 1809, for the same. On comparing this last with the first edition, I find it the same, word for word, but less carefully printed.

After a second edition of the History had appeared, the question of infant-baptism was taken up by several opponents; amongst whom Dr. Wall, in his 'Defence,' specifies Mr. Emlyn, Mr. Whiston, and especially Mr. Gale; to whose 'Reflections' he at length felt himself called on to reply, not so much from any pertinence or cogency of the arguments, as from the vaunting style of his performance, and the high character which the author bore among those of his sect.

This reply, 'in vindication,' he says, 'partly of the cause and 'partly of himself,' he published in the year 1720, being then seventy-five years old, under the title of 'A Defence of the History 'of Infant-baptism, against the Reflections of Mr. Gale and others:' having previously holden a personal conference with his opponent, in the presence of Mr. Whiston and other friends, and having obtained more full and correct information concerning the present state and opinions of the English baptists, from a distinguished member of their communion, Mr. Joseph Stennet, of whom he makes honourable mention.

For the good service performed in this 'Defence,' Dr. Wall received from the University of Oxford the honour of a Doctor of Divinity's degree: which, it appears from the catalogue of graduates, was conferred on him by diploma, on the 31st of October, 1720.

The greater portion of the work is occupied in closely following and replying to the statements of Mr. Gale; whose *learning* he deems much overrated, and of whose *accuracy* he has but a mean opinion: sixty-four pages at the beginning are devoted to the observations of M. Bernard, Mr. Emlyn, and Mr. Whiston; and about twenty-five at the end, to a work of Mr. Davye of Leicester, who had recently entered the field of controversy in behalf of adult-baptism<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> Dr. Wall seems fully persuaded, that the greater part of Mr. Gale's book had been compiled, either by himself or others, a considerable time before its publication, and was not originally designed for an answer to *him* in particular:

(See *Defence*, pp. 423, 432 in vol. ii.) and even asserts that the third letter was actually *published* 'a good while before 'the rest, as a *specimen* of what the book 'should be.' (*Defence*, p. 430. in vol. ii.)



At the same time our author was preparing for the press a *third* edition of his History, with such alterations and additions, as his further reading and communication with learned men during the interval of thirteen years had suggested as desirable. And to the Defence he subjoined an Appendix, of twenty-five pages, containing the most material additions and alterations which would be found in the forthcoming edition; for the benefit of those persons who had been purchasers of the former ones.

In the same year, 1720, was completed, in two volumes octavo, the *third* edition of the History, 'with large additions:' from which, as having received the author's last revision, and being published under his own inspection, the present one has been carefully prepared: with the addition of some short notes by the editor, designed as references or illustrations for the reader's assistance, but leaving the main arguments and proofs exactly as they were delivered by the author.

It may be mentioned, that Dr. Wall's History and Defence having become very scarce and much called for a few years ago, a reprint of them was undertaken by a London bookseller in the year 1819. But as one chief object in this speculation was *profit*, so little care seems to have been bestowed on publishing the text *correctly*, that the impression is not deserving of further notice. It is in three octavo volumes.

Walchius, in his valuable '*Bibliotheca Theologica*,' (5 tom. 8<sup>o</sup>. 1762, &c.) at vol. iii. p. 648, asserts that a *fourth* edition was published in 1731. Perhaps he was mistaken; as I can neither find such an edition, nor discover any other notice of it. He likewise acquaints us, that it was holden in so great estimation on the continent, that a *Latin* translation was published, by professor Schlosser, of Bremen, with observations and confirmations of the arguments, in two vols. quarto, in 1748 and 1753. I was most anxious to peruse this version, while the present edition was in course of preparation: but could not find it in any library, public or private, nor could I procure from the continent more than the *second* volume, which of course could not alone be made use of. It is clear that the translator had seen the *second* edition only. The notes of M. Schlosser are voluminous, and sometimes convey additional illustrations of importance: but much of them relates particularly to disputes on the subject of baptism, carried on by writers of his own time and country. For his main scope and design, he refers to a general Dissertation, prefixed to the *first* volume, which I had no opportunity of seeing.

It may here be noticed also, that an *abridgment* of the History was published in the *Dutch* language by Conradus Bremerus, (with the addition of five Dissertations,) at Amsterdam, in the year 1740; Bremerus having been induced to this step by learning, on a perusal of Dr. Wall's work, that the practice of infant-baptism in the Christian Church could claim a much higher antiquity than he had previously supposed.

Besides the foregoing works on the subject of *baptism*, a few other pieces of Dr. Wall's have been given to the public. Among these are,

1. A little tract, or rather prospectus of a designed treatise, bearing the following title: 'Some new inquiries relating to the following curious subjects: viz.

' A threefold Motion of the Earth.

' The Rectification of the Calendar.

' The Flowing and Ebbing of the sea.

' The Nature of the Loadstone.

' The Variation of the Compass.

' The Cause of Sea-currents and Trade-winds.

' The various Motions of all the Cœlestial Orbs.

' The finding out the true place of the Moon:

' And facilitating the discovery of the Longitude.

' To which is added an Appendix, containing an inquiry into the nature of Comets, and of the dissolution of the World by Fire. By William Wall, author of the History of Infant-baptism. Most humbly proposed, and offered to the consideration of the learned and ingenious as subjects of further contemplation and improvement. But in a more particular manner to the honourable, the learned, and ingenious Gentlemen of the Royal Society.' London (no date,) 4to.

This tract consists merely of pages 1-12. and 23, 24; beside a Dedication to George Prince of Wales, and an address to the Royal Society, both signed B. H. J.; also a short address to the reader, without any signature. The author does not actually produce all which his title had promised, but contents himself with observing, that upon the two subjects, of facilitating the discovery of the Longitude, and the manner of finding out the true place of the Moon, 'he has something to offer to the public hereafter.'

2. Nichols, in his (*Anecdotes of Bowyer*, or) *Literary Anecdotes*, vol. i. p. 114, states that in the year 1715, Bowyer printed a *Sermon* by Dr. Wall; which is not mentioned by Cooke, in his *Preacher's Assistant*. He does not inform us either of the subject or the text: and I have not been able to meet with the Sermon itself.

About this period he devoted much time to the critical study of the Holy Scriptures; marking the various readings of the original texts, and comparing together the principal versions. The result of these studies he committed to paper, intending them for publication: but so great was his caution, or distrust of his own attainments, that he himself did not publish any portion, although he lived twelve or thirteen years after this time.

3. After his death, a friend, in whose hands his papers were placed, sent forth, in an octavo volume, ‘Brief critical notes, especially on the various readings of the *New Testament* books; with a ‘Preface concerning the texts cited herein from the *Old Testament*; ‘as also concerning the use of the Septuagint translation. By ‘Will. Wall, S. T. P.’ *London*, 1730. The anonymous editor assures his readers, that the author had designed these papers for the press, subject to the revision and judgment of himself and a learned friend: and that he found himself, on their perusal, fully justified in presenting them to the world, almost in the precise state in which they had come into his hands.

The volume commences with a long and valuable preface; the opening sentence of which unfolds to us the pious feeling which led to the composition of these ‘Notes.’

‘Since I have grown old,’ says the author, ‘I have chosen to do ‘what many pious clergymen have advised to be done by any Christian that has a near prospect of forsaking this world: viz. to leave ‘off in great measure the reading of other books, and to spend the ‘remainder of his time in reading (only, or at least chiefly) the Holy ‘Scriptures themselves: and, if his time be prolonged, to read the ‘whole of them over and over.’

From a note appended to the volume we learn the period of his life at which it was composed, and also the fact that it received mature revision: ‘*SOLI DEO GLORIA. Septuagenarius scripsi. Octogenarius descripsi.*’

The Annotations extend to all the books of the New Testament. Those on St. Paul’s Epistles (and the Acts) are in *chronological* order; a plan which he judged very useful towards the clearing up of difficulties, and declared ‘he thought it great pity that there ‘was not an edition of them placed in that order.’ A work, which has recently been accomplished by Mr. Townshend.

4. After an interval of four years, the remainder of Dr. Wall’s labours in this department was published, probably by the same unknown friend, with the following title: ‘Critical Notes on the *Old Testament*; wherein the present Hebrew Text is explained, and in



‘ many places amended from the ancient versions, more particularly  
 ‘ from that of the LXXII. Drawn up in the order the several  
 ‘ books were written, or may most conveniently be read. To which  
 ‘ is prefixed a large introduction, adjusting the authority of the Ma-  
 ‘ soretic Bible, and vindicating it from the objections of Mr. Whiston  
 ‘ and the author of the “Grounds and Reasons of the Christian  
 ‘ Religion.” By the late learned W. Wall, D.D. author of the His-  
 ‘ tory of Infant-baptism. Now first published from his original  
 ‘ manuscript.’ 2 vols. 8°. *London*, 1734.

The *Introduction* is that which had been previously attached to the Notes on the *New Testament*; not indeed with due propriety, but because at that time it was not intended that those on the *Old Testament* should see the light: a determination which probably was changed by the favourable reception given to the former volume.

It has been handed down to us that Dr. Wall was warmly attached to bishop Atterbury, his diocesan<sup>c</sup>. It appears that he carried on a correspondence with that gifted prelate, especially concerning the times in which the four Gospels were written. In ‘Atterbury’s Epistolary Correspondence,’ &c., 8°. 1784, vol. iii. are three letters addressed to him by Wall, in the years 1721 and 1722; the former two on the above subject, the latter on finding out who was ‘the ‘brother’ spoken of by St. Paul at 2 Cor. viii. 18, 19, an inquiry to which his attention had been specially invited by the bishop. There are two letters of Atterbury in reply, expressing his high sense of the Doctor’s worth and learning.

Besides the above, I am not aware of any thing having been published bearing our author’s name.

That Dr. Wall enjoyed a high reputation, deservedly acquired by his works, is shewn, not only by the abovementioned honourable testimonies of the House of Convocation and the University of Oxford; but likewise by the publicly expressed opinions of many learned men, both Englishmen and foreigners; some of whom agreed with him in sentiment, while others entirely differed.—Among these, the following few may be perused with interest.

Mr. WHISTON,—who had published a treatise against Infant-baptism, and late in life declared himself a Baptist, and finally forsook the communion of the Church of England on Trinity Sunday, 1747;—Mr. Whiston,—in a pamphlet entitled ‘Friendly advice to the Bap-

<sup>c</sup> His daughter is reported to have declared, that his zeal was so intense in this direction, that in case of the bishop’s re-

call from exile, he would have lighted up all Whittlebury Forest at his own expense.

‘tists,’ (8°. 1748,) asserts, ‘The body of these Baptists have in general a very fair character; and not only from Bishop Burnet,—but from *the greatest of their adversaries*, I mean the *very honest, learned, and pious Dr. Wall*: whose History of Infant-baptism (not as to the controversial part, but as to the facts therein contained) seems to me most accurately done; and may, I think, be depended on by the Baptists themselves. Now with this Dr. Wall I became particularly acquainted, soon after I had published my “Primitive Infant-baptism revived,” and went twenty miles on foot to debate that matter with him. He afterwards came up to London, and had a conference with Mr. Gale, his learned antagonist, myself, and other Baptists, at my house: and appeared to me all along utterly unable to justify himself in opposition to the evidence produced by us against him. However, Dr. Wall gives the Baptists this character,’ &c.

CROSBY, the historian of the English Baptists, though an opponent of his principles, styles him ‘the ingenious Dr. Wall;’ and pronounces his work to be ‘an elaborate history.’

WATERLAND speaks of him as ‘a learned and judicious writer:’ and frequently refers to his authority when treating on the subject of *baptism*.

BINGHAM, in his ‘Antiquities of the Christian Church,’ book ix. chap. 4. sect. 5. on the subject of baptism, gives a high character of this work.

WOTTON, in his ‘Miscellaneous Discourses,’ vol. i. p. 103, when discussing the usefulness of Talmudic study to a Christian divine, writes as follows: ‘The substance of the reasonings of learned men’ (viz. on the point of Infant-baptism having been derived from the manner of admitting proselytes among the Jews in our Lord’s time) ‘has been with great judgment digested and published in our own language within these few years, by Mr. Wall, in his “History of Infant-baptism.” That work of his, (as far as it goes, which is for the first four centuries after Christ,) is by much the most finished collection of testimonies from Christian writers that has been made upon that subject.’

With respect to the reputation which he maintained among *foreign* scholars, I have mentioned above some honourable testimonies to the worth of our author’s works; and will merely add here the character given to his History by Walchius: ‘Historia est hæc opus quod auctoris singularem eruditionem atque industriam commendat: quodque ad dogma de Baptismo infantum illustrandum ac

‘confirmandum multa præbet adjumenta.’ *Bibl. Theol.* tom. v. p. 401.

As for his general habits, they seem to have been studious and domestic. In his family he had to sustain several trials; his wife having been taken from him more than twenty years before his own death, and four out of his five children having died before their father.

From some anecdotes communicated by his surviving daughter to a correspondent of the ‘Gentleman’s Magazine,’ where they are printed (vol. i. for 1784, p. 434,) he appears to have been of rather a lively turn of mind, and sometimes disposed to indulge in sportive sallies of wit.

But, as was observed above, so little of the personal history of this conscientious divine and laborious scholar has been committed to writing; that having nothing to produce in an authentic and satisfactory shape, it is better to be silent on this head; and to rest his claim to the gratitude of posterity on the result of his persevering exertions to vindicate and uphold the pure forms of worship adopted by our excellent Church.

Of his opponent, the details are more ample. Mr. John GALE, a man of high character for learning, especially among the Baptists, to which sect he belonged, and in whose communion he for some years acted as a minister, although (on Whiston’s<sup>c</sup> authority) he was never ordained a presbyter, was born on the 26th of May, 1680, in London, of which place his father was an eminent and worthy citizen. From some early proofs of capacity displayed by his son, the good man destined him to the ministry; and with that view spared no expense in giving him a liberal education. We are told that his early youth exhibited an uncommon application to study, and the improvement and adorning of his mind with literature; accompanied by a careful avoidance of every kind of vice.

Thus early prepared, he was sent to Leyden, to finish his studies, and qualify himself for the duties of his future profession.

Soon after his arrival at that university, being then seventeen years of age, he lost his mother: an event which determined him to return home, so soon as he should have finished his course of *philosophy*, the principal point of his study. This having been accomplished in less than two years, he received the degree

<sup>c</sup> ‘Friendly Advice to the Baptists,’ 8°. 1748. p. 13.



of Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy; on which occasion a highly complimentary letter was despatched to his father by his tutor.

His first publication took place at this period: it is said to have been a Thesis ‘*De Ente ejusque Conceptu*,’ which he dedicated to his father and his two uncles, sir John and sir Joseph Wolf.

From Leyden Mr. Gale proceeded to Amsterdam, where he studied under the celebrated Limborch; and formed an acquaintance with M. Le Clere, with whom he kept up a correspondence for many years.

After his return to England, we find him studying the ancient classics, and the Oriental languages, with assiduity. ‘He also,’ says the writer of his *life* prefixed to his *Sermons*, ‘read over and considered the primitive writers of the Christian church: by which he contracted a just esteem for them, neither approving the conduct of those who slight them, nor that of others who rely too much upon their authority.’

Four years afterwards he was offered the degree of Doctor in Divinity by the university of Dort, on the condition of giving his assent to the articles of their synod; but this offer, from motives of conscience, he declined.

Dr. Wall’s *History of Infant-baptism* making its appearance in the year 1705, and being highly lauded, Mr. Gale prepared a reply—(it is said, before he was twenty-seven years old:) when subsequently published, this piece met with many eulogists, among whom were Dr. Whitby, Dr. Wotton, and Mr. Whiston, whose friendship, together with that of other eminent men, he enjoyed.

About the age of thirty-five he began to preach regularly with unwearied diligence; ‘resolving firmly to regard no man in the discharge of his duty. His style was easy and natural, his expressions strong and lively, his reasonings clear and convincing.’—‘The grand principle which he endeavoured to root the deepest, and cultivate with the greatest care, in his own mind, as well as in the mind of his hearers, was that of *sincerity*: upon which he thought our happiness or misery in a future state will depend. He therefore considered that this would be of the highest importance, when many of the acquirements we here gain one above another, will fade and wither away. Which made him very humble, notwithstanding his great abilities. This also disposed him to judge charitably of those who differed from his sentiments; and to be very diligent in his inquiries after truth. His embracing the doctrine of the

‘*Trinity* was one effect of this: for he did not run into this belief from any prejudices of education, or bias put upon his mind in his youth; having been early introduced into the conversation of those who examined the several doctrines of the Christian revelation with the utmost freedom; amongst whom were some (foreigners as well as others) of the first rank for learning and abilities.’

Some time before his death, Mr. Gale had formed the design of publishing an *Exposition of the New Testament* in the form of Lectures; and had drawn up an *Introduction* opening his method, which seems to have included a *new translation* and a *paraphrase*, giving the interpretation of various and perhaps opposite expositors, leaving the student ‘to judge for himself with just liberty and *true* freedom of thought.’

His conversation was sweet, but not abundant: he preferred to say much in a few words. His manner was affable and courteous to all, particularly to the lower classes. He never overpowered the ignorant with his learning. He sympathized with the afflicted, and aided the distressed. ‘In fourteen years’ intimate converse with him,’ says his biographer, ‘I never knew him mastered by anger, or disturbed by any irregular passions.’

He had entertained several useful designs before his death: as, that of making the study of the *Oriental tongues* more easy; of giving a *translation of the Septuagint* agreeable to Dr. Grabe’s edition: also, a history of the notion of *Original Sin*, tracing the opinion from its first rise, and shewing how little grounds there are for the supposition that God could be its author.

He wrote to his father, on the appearance of Dr. Wall’s ‘Defence’ twelve [*lege* nine] years after his ‘Reflections’ had appeared, as follows: ‘Dr. Wall has written a Defence of his History of Infant-baptism; in which he has treated me very roughly, and has endeavoured to enrage the clergy as well as our own people against me: beside which there appears not to be much in his book: however, I am preparing an answer, which,’ &c.

But all these good intentions were frustrated by a slow fever, which carried him off in the forty-first year of his age, in the year 1721.

Such is the brief outline of Mr. Gale’s life and pursuits, as extracted from a memoir prefixed to his *Sermons*, in 4 volumes 8°. published in 1726<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>f</sup> In a note to ‘Atterbury’s Correspondence,’ vol. iii. p. 372, the editor states that an original portrait of Mr. Gale by Highmore, from which Vertue

Crosby, in his 'History of the English Baptists,' vol. iv. has abstracted the foregoing account, (only mistaking *Leyden* for *Dort*, as the university which offered him the degree of Doctor of Divinity.)

Mr. Gale states, in the advertisement to his Reflections, that being originally written for the private perusal of a friend, they were not intended for publication: indeed that an answer to Dr. Wall was expected from an eminent Baptist minister, Mr. Joseph Stennets; who had already published a treatise on the subject, was possessed of great learning, and had personally discussed the point with Dr. Wall. But on its being found that nothing was to be expected from that quarter, his friends urged him to the attempt, lest Dr. Wall's work, having already obtained a high degree of popularity, should be taken for unanswerable. The piece was *published* in 1711, although said to be *written* in 1705 and 1706, when only the *first* edition of Dr. Wall's History had appeared: and is justly charged by Dr. Wall with containing objections to passages which had been either altered or wholly expunged in a second edition, published four years before its appearance.

No reprint of the Reflections took place for upwards of a century: but the appearance of a new impression of Dr. Wall in 1819, 'induced an editor to think of sending Dr. Gale's book again to 'press.' The new impression came out in octavo at London, in 1820. The editor has omitted the larger quotations in learned languages which were given at length in the notes to the preceding one: and has added, of his own, 'A Review of the Authorities for 'the Existence of Jewish Proselyte Baptism,' directed against Dr. Wall's Introduction. As this piece did not belong to either of our authors, and concerns itself with a much more modern state of the question, no notice is taken of it here; and I have, in this instance, as before, printed from the original edition, published under the author's own superintendence; merely adding a few illustrative notes, as in the other volumes.

We have seen above the various pieces which Mr. Gale had *designed*: I am not aware that any were actually published, at least

engraved the print prefixed to his Sermons, was then (1784) in possession of the Rev. Mr. Duncombe.

At page 538 of the same volume is given a letter, (reprinted from the 'British Journal' of April 27, 1723,) stating that Dr. Gale's widow, being left with a large and destitute family, had been enabled, by contributions raised

among her friends, to set up a coffeehouse in Finch-lane, London: where her excellent character and exemplary conduct entitled her to the public encouragement and support.

§ His works, consisting of the *Answer to Russen*, *Sermons*, and *Poems*, with some account of his life, were published in five vols. 8o. London, 1732.



with his name, besides four volumes of Sermons. In these, as might be expected, he frequently discusses the subject of *baptism*, with allusions to the controversy. As in vol. ii. Sermon V. by the instance of our Saviour's baptism he defends the custom of *dipping*, and evidently alludes to Dr. Wall's preference of that mode above *sprinkling*.

In Sermon VI. p. 159, he repeats his argument from Matthew xxviii. that all who are to be baptized are first to be *taught*. He alludes to his own sense of μαθητεύω, *to teach*, although some men 'of great learning and reputation' interpret it *to disciple*. P. 169, he briefly sums up the arguments used by Dr. Wall and others in defence of Infant-baptism. P. 170, he asserts, that among the Jews pots and cups, &c. were baptized. P. 174, abuses the Jewish rabbis as fools and blasphemers. This whole discourse is very strong in defence of *adult-baptism*.

In Sermon VII. he argues against those who undervalue *all baptism*.

In the eighth, he states the 'scheme' of such as deny baptism: and argues against the Jews' and the Talmud's assertion, that the practice existed in our Saviour's time, and that he derived it from the Jews: or that this original of baptism can be any good foundation for the baptizing of *infants*.

In the next three Sermons, the same argument is followed up; baptism is maintained to be indispensable; and that there is no baptism but that of *adults*, and by *immersion*.

I have stated above, that Mr. Gale enjoyed a considerable reputation as a scholar, and was on terms of intimacy with learned men, both in England and on the Continent.

Among the latter class was Mr. Le CLERC, whose acquaintance he assiduously studied, and to whom on several grounds he seems to have looked up with much respect.

Of *our own* countrymen, Dr. WHITBY, who indeed had been frequently eulogized by him, is disposed to speak and think highly of his attainments. In the preface to his 'Answer to Edwards,' (8°. 1712,) he calls Gale a 'very learned antipædobaptist:' and in that to his treatise, 'Dissertatio de S. Scripturarum interpretatione secundum Patrum commentarios,' (8°. 1714,) he speaks of the 'Reflections' as 'literæ ad invidiam doctæ;' and asserts that the author has demonstrated the point of infant-baptism in the primitive ages of the Church to be a dubious and unsettled one.

CROSBY, as I observed above, repeats the account of his life and works given by the editor of his Sermons.

Dr. WOTTON is sometimes adduced as speaking in high terms of his performance. But if any person will take the trouble of reading over the eighth chapter of Dr. Wotton's first volume of his 'Miscellaneous Discourses,' he will be able to judge how far this writer concedes to him that degree of merit which his biographers would claim on such authority.

WHISTON, as holding (late in life) similar sentiments on the subject of baptism, writing on the same question, and being personally acquainted with him, is led to speak of his performance and acquirements, which he does in terms of high praise :

'—The most learned Baptist you ever had, Mr. John Gale.'

'—Mr. Gale, their most eminent defender.'

'—The learned Mr. Gale, who was so very hearty and indefatigable in forming and supporting our "Society for promoting Primitive Christianity," in which he was our chairman for a considerable time.'

'I once heard their *most learned vindicator*, Mr. Gale, who was never ordained so much as a presbyter, put up such public prayers, as well as preach, in a congregation of baptists in London, many years ago.' *Friendly Advice to the Baptists*. 8°. Stamford, 1748.

It only remains to add, that with a view of rendering this edition deserving of public attention, all the quotations, both from ancient and modern authors, have been carefully examined and verified; and their several passages referred to with more minute exactness, agreeably to the latest and best editions: a task of urgent necessity, since the errors which had crept in were very numerous and often remarkable;—but one of much tedious labour, for which no return appears upon the page.

I regret however to say that some few instances still remain unexamined: where either I was unable to meet with the work in question—as for instance, that of Mr. Davye—or the particular edition which had been used, and which perhaps contained some peculiarity of reading.

Whatever has been *added* in the shape of notes is enclosed within brackets, for the sake of distinction: in order that the *authors* may not inadvertently be made responsible for any errors into which the *editor* has fallen.

HENRY COTTON.

CASHEL, IRELAND,  
October, 1835.

WALL, VOL. I.

b

## THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

---

FORASMUCH as the commission given by our Saviour to his disciples, in the time of his mortal life, to baptize in the country of Judæa, is not at all set down in Scripture; only it is said, that they baptized<sup>a</sup> a great many: and the enlargement of that commission given them afterwards, Matth. xxviii. 19, to perform the same office among all the heathen nations, is set down in such brief words, that there is no particular direction given what they were to do in reference to the children of those that received the faith: and among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any *infant*; nor is there, on the other side, any account of any *Christian's* child, whose baptism was put off till he was grown up, or who was baptized at man's age: (for all the persons that are mentioned in Scripture to have been baptized were the children of heathens, or else of Jews, who did not believe in Christ at that time when those their children were born:) and since the proofs drawn by consequences from some places of Scripture, for any one side of this question, are not so plain as to hinder the arguments drawn from other places for the other side, from seeming still considerable to those that have no help from the history of the Scripture-times for the better understanding of the rules of Scripture: it is no wonder that the readers of Scripture, at this distance from the apostles' times, have fallen into contrary sentiments about the meaning of our Saviour's command, and the practice of the apostles in reference to the baptizing of infants.

But since the practice of the ancient Christians, that lived nigh the times of the apostles, being more largely delivered, is more easily known: that such as have gone about to give an account thereof out of the ancient records should give so contrary accounts as they do, is a great wonder and a great shame.

For they do not only differ in the understanding of the meaning of several of the places produced; but also as to matter of fact,

<sup>a</sup> John iv. 1, 2; and iii. 22, 26.



(whether they be rightly cited or not,) do charge one another<sup>b</sup> with forgery: and are come, as Mr. Baxter complains, to 'Thou liest,' and 'Thou liest.' And indeed among all the books of controversy between Papists and Protestants, or others, that are scandalous for false quotations, there is none comparable to one that is written on this occasion, which I shall at present forbear to name.

Such a thing done by mistake, or for want of skill, is bad enough; but if it be done wilfully, it is hard to think of any thing that is a greater wickedness; for it goes the way to destroy the common faith of mankind, by which we are apt to rely upon a writer, that how zealous soever he may be for his opinion, he will not forge matters of fact, nor *speak wickedly* (though it be) *for God*, as Job says<sup>c</sup>.

Some other accounts also are very partial, mentioning only that which makes for their side, and leaving out parts of the clauses which they cite.

The inconvenience of this is the worse, because it is in a matter which would have a great influence to settle and determine this unlucky controversy; provided that the accounts of the eldest times were given fairly and impartially, and so that the reader might be satisfied of the truth and impartiality of them.

For when there is in Scripture a plain command to proselyte or make disciples all nations, baptizing them; but the method of doing it is not in all particulars *expressly* directed; it not being particularly mentioned whether they were to admit into this discipleship and baptism the infants of those that were converted; as the Jewish church had always done to the infants of proselytes (giving them circumcision, as we know by Scripture, and baptism as we are assured by their records): or whether they were to proceed in a new way, and baptize only the adult persons themselves: there is nobody that will doubt but that the apostles knew what was to be done in this case: and consequently, that the Christian churches in their time did as they should do in this matter.

And since the apostles lived, some of them, to near the end of the first century, and St. John something beyond it; and had in their own time propagated the Christian faith and practice into so many countries; it can never sink into the head of any considering man, but that such Christians as were ancient men about one hundred, or one hundred and fifty years after that time of the apostles' death, which is the year of Christ 200 or 250, must easily know whether

<sup>b</sup> More Proofs for Infants' Church-membership and Baptism, p. 346.

<sup>c</sup> Job xiii. 7.

<sup>d</sup> See the Introduction.

infant-baptism were in use at the time of the apostles' death or not: because the fathers of some of them, and grandfathers of most of them, were born before that time, and were themselves infants in the apostles' days; and so were baptized then in their infancy, if then that were the order: or their baptism deferred to adult age, if that were the use then. For such a thing as the general baptizing of infants, being a rite public and notorious, and in which the whole body of the people, poor and rich, pastors and laymen, men and women, are concerned, cannot be forgotten in a short time, nor altered without a great deal of noise. In a point of doctrine delivered by tradition, a mistake may happen: or in the account of some matter of fact done by some particular man: but for a rite of universal concern, a whole church cannot forget it, much less all the churches in several parts of the world in so short a time. We Englishmen cannot be ignorant whether infants were usually baptized in England or not, in queen Elizabeth's days, which is the same distance. The man that thinks this possible, is one that is not used to consider.

It is to be remembered likewise, that the apostles, before they died, chose men of whom they had good proof, to teach the churches the same things that they had done; many of whom lived till a great while after the apostles were dead: which makes the time that needs to be kept in memory so much the shorter.

Some pretend to slight this argument, as not being a Scripture one: but it is that too by a direct consequence. For since the Scripture promises that the church shall be led into all truth, i. e. all truth that is necessary or fundamental; to follow the example of the primitive church must be, by the rule of Scripture, a sure way not to err in fundamentals.

It were (as bishop Stillingfleet observes in another case<sup>e</sup>) 'a great blot and dishonour to Christian religion, if the primitive churches could not hold to their first institution, not for one age after the apostles: no not the purest and best churches.'

But the truth is, there is no man that does really slight this argument; though those that have no skill in it, or do suspect that it will go against their side, will make as if they did. And therefore you shall see, both on the one side and on the other, those men who, for a flourish, do pretend that they lay small stress on it, as having proof enough from Scripture, yet take all the pains possible to bring this argument to bear on their side; and that so zealously,

<sup>e</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, p. 226. Edit. 167-. or in his collected Works, vol. ii.

that they often do it unfairly. There is no Christian that loves to hear or to admit, that all the ancient churches practised otherwise than he does in a controverted matter.

Seeing therefore that all the arguments from Scripture for each side, have been so searched and so often bandied to and fro, that not much more can be said to illustrate them : and that where a command in Scripture is given in brief and general words, the practice of the primitive church thereupon gives us the best direction for the sense in which it is to be applied to particular cases : and that a great many have desired to see the history of this practice fully and fairly represented : I have thought it worth my pains to draw up and publish such a collection as is expressed in the title.

And if any one ask, what there is done in this more than in others that have been already ; I answer,

1. That the best collections of this nature have not been published in the English language ; and it is for the use of Englishmen that this is intended.

2. That this is more complete than any I have seen ; because among those I have seen, each one omitted some testimonies which the other had : and it is easy for one that collects out of all of them, to have more than any one : beside that, no inconsiderable number of these have been gathered from my own reading.

The first and best collection that I have seen is Cassander's ; then Vossius', and of late Dr. Hammond's, and out of him Mr. Walker's. The rest are mostly intermixt, by those that produce them, with their proofs and arguments from Scripture, and must be picked out : so there are many in the books of Calvin, Bullinger, Featly, Tombes, Marshall, Cobbet, Baxter, Danvers, Wills, &c.

3. I pretend it to be more impartial than the rest : for most of them are collections of such quotations only as make for that side of the question for which they are disputing. And here my reader will say ; ' If those produced by you do make some for one side, and ' some for the other, they will leave us in the same ambiguity that ' they find us.' To which I must answer ; that if he will come to the reading of them with the same resolved impartiality that I set myself to the writing of them, I believe he will find it otherwise. However, the only way to pass a true judgment is to see both together.

4. I have recited the places more at large than others have done. One single sentence, or (as they frequently cite) a bit or scrap of a sentence, gives but a very imperfect, and oftentimes a mistaken account of the author's meaning ; but the context added shews the tenor and scope of his discourse.



After all, I acknowledged that there are in the books I mentioned, and others, several quotations which I have not here: and the reason is partly because I confine myself to authors that lived and wrote within the first *four hundred* years (though some of them outliving that term, wrote some of their works after it); and that I do, because all men of reading know, that from that time to the time of the Albigenses, about the year 1150, the practice is unquestionable; and partly because many of the quotations were false, and so altered, that when I came to search the original, there was there nothing to the purpose; or they were out of spurious books, &c. I have been forced to write one chapter<sup>f</sup> of this work to give an account what sort of quotations I have left out, and for what reasons: and if any one will inform me of any passage in any author within the term limited, which he, after the reading of the said chapter, shall yet judge to be to the purpose; I will, if I live to see any more editions of this mean work, put it in (if it seem to me to be to the purpose); and that indifferently, whether it make *for* or *against* pædobaptism. For I desire that this collection should be as complete and impartial as may be.

When I say in the title, 'of all the passages,' I do not pretend but that in St. Austin there are a great many more; but all to the same purpose. For he in his disputes with the Pelagians has whole books, wherein he proves original sin from the practice of pædobaptism. In those I have only taken here and there a piece: since every body knows his doctrine.

I have recited the originals of all the principal quotations; because in this matter writers have so accused one another of forgery or perverting of testimonies by false translations, &c., that people are grown distrustful. Now they will be satisfied that if I have mistranslated any thing, I did not do it willingly; for then I should never have added the author's own words for the discovery of it.

I have made two parts of this work. The first contains the principal quotations, with some notes drawn from them. I have rejected all the spurious ones: only I have put a few of the most ancient of them together in the last chapter. The first two chapters have no quotations that speak *expressly* of infant-baptism: but of infants being *discipled to Christ*, (which must, I think, import their baptism,) and of original sin as it affects infants: of the necessity of baptism to salvation: of baptism succeeding circumcision, &c.

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. chap. 1.

But all the rest are concerning infant-baptism expressly, either *for* or *against* it.

The other part contains an account of some matters proper for the fuller explication of the primitive practice. Of which the chief is, the inquiry concerning the baptism and parentage of those who are brought as instances of persons not baptized in infancy, though born of Christian parents: for which work I wish I had been a little better furnished. Yet I think I have rectified some mistakes concerning some of them that had passed currently.

I have noted in the margin, over against every author, the age wherein he flourished, (or began to be a man of note, by writing books, &c.) viz. how many years it was after the apostles' time: (which I make to end with the year of Christ 100, though St. John lived a year or two beyond it :) and this I do, because during all the apostles' time, every body is satisfied that the church had an infallible direction.

I think it needful to give the reader notice beforehand, that in the sayings of the Fathers here recited, he will find, that as we, beside the word 'to baptize,' do use the word 'to christen' in the same sense, so they used several words to signify baptism. The most usual was ἀναγεννᾶν, to *regenerate*; which is also a Scripture word for it: sometimes they express it καινοποιεῖν, or ἀνακαινίζειν, to *renew*; and frequently ἀγιάζειν, to *sanctify*. They frequently by this word 'the *grace*' do mean baptism. Sometimes they call it the *seal*, and frequently φωτισμὸς *illumination*, as it is also called, Heb. vi. 4, and sometimes τελεείωσις, *initiation*. The sense of the places will shew that where the words are of an infant, or other person, *regenerated, renewed, sealed, enlightened, initiated, sanctified*, &c., we must understand *baptized*.

I have added a *Dissuasive from Schism*, or men's renouncing Christian communion with one another, on account of this difference in opinion: for which I wish I had a vein of speaking more powerfully. For I am fully persuaded, and clearly of opinion, that neither this nor most of our other differences, are any sufficient or reasonable ground of flying to that dreadful extremity, of separation.

One thing I was resolved on: that if I wrote any thing, it should be something which should give nobody any occasion to force me to write again. I said in the first edition, that if any one would write against this, they should either write against the men that have been dead these thirteen hundred years; or, if they found fault with the notes that I have here and there made on their

words, as not naturally drawn from them ; my answer was beforehand, that I would refer it to the readers, whether they be or no.

But I find that I must partake of the fate of writers : only mine has been in the main a much more favourable one than came to my share. It becomes me humbly and thankfully to acknowledge on one side, that the honour publicly done to my book, and the kind reception it has had from many worthy men, has been far greater than I can ever think it does deserve. But on the other side, a certain anonymous author of a pamphlet, called ‘An Account of the ‘Proceedings in the Convocation, 1705,’ did presently upon the first edition give me a rebuke. To which I in the preface to the second edition gave what answer I thought needful. But that pamphlet being now, I suppose, out of print and forgotten, I do not think my answer to it worth reprinting.

Since the second edition, I have had more adversaries. Two or three of which being antipædobaptists, though they could not charge the quotations with any falsehood, yet disliking the consequence which naturally follows from them, (which is, that the Christians in the time of those authors do appear plainly to have baptized their infants,) have laboured strenuously, and by different ways and evasions, to enervate that.

One of them has done this in so large an oration, in such a popular way of pleading, with such wresting of the sense of the places, and in so challenging and insulting a manner ; that I have been forced to write a Defence of this History against their several attacks. But I was resolved, that I would not, by mixing such various squabbles *pro* and *contra*, interrupt the thread of it : but print the Defence separate. If any reader have been moved with any of their objections, and do think it worth his while to see what I have to say in answer to them ; I must desire him to look for it there, and not here.

I have in this third edition added some quotations, which either I have met with in the ancients since the last, or which have been communicated to me by learned men : and some few new remarks. The new quotations do make for infant-baptism : and if I had met with, or there had been communicated, any new ones that had made *against* it, I would, as I once promised, freely have inserted them. But I meet with none. There are some passages of Barnabas, of Dionysius Alexandrinus, of Eusebius concerning Polycrates, &c., which Mr. Gale (one of my said adversaries) has quoted and tried to enforce for antipædobaptism. I have in the said Defence shewn



them, I think, to be not to the purpose. And as upon an impartial consideration of them, I think they are not; I have not encumbered the history with them.

I conclude with a story told by Cassander<sup>h</sup>, which he makes long, but the substance is this: 'A man of note among the anti-pædobaptists, being told that there was a full agreement of all the ancients who do with one mouth affirm, that this custom of baptizing infants has been in use ever since the apostles' times, confessed ingenuously, that he did put a great value upon such a consent of the church; and should be much moved with such an agreement of the ancient Christian writers; and that if this could be proved by competent testimonies, he was not so obstinate as to slight so forcible a reason: especially if such authors were produced to prove this, as lived very nigh the apostles' times. And therefore he earnestly desired that the testimonies of this matter should be shewn to him. And having read them, and (as he was a man of good sense) diligently considered them; he altered that opinion which he had taken up from a mistaken understanding of the Scripture. Which happened in him because he was endued with these three good qualities:

1. 'The fear of God and reverence for his word: so that it was by occasion of that zeal for truth that he fell into this way.

2. 'Judgment and good sense: so that he quickly perceived the force of an argument.

3. 'Modesty, and a meek temper, which caused that when he had heard and comprehended the truth, he did not obstinately withstand it.' To which I shall here add an advice of bishop Stillingfleet to his clergy<sup>i</sup>, whose sayings and advices all people love to hear: 'Where the sense [of Scripture] appears doubtful, and disputes have been raised about it; inquire into the sense of the Christian church in the first ages, as the best interpreter of Scripture: as whether, &c. and whether baptism were not to be administered to infants,' &c.

<sup>h</sup> Præfat. in Testimonia de Pædobaptismo.

Clergy, p. 118. [or in his collected Works, folio, vol. iii. p. 659.]

<sup>i</sup> Duties and Rights of the Parochial

THE  
CONTENTS OF THE INTRODUCTION.

---

1. THE Jews baptized all proselytes of the nations that were converted to their religion. § 2. Their proof from Moses' law that they ought so to do. § 3. They baptized also the infant children whom such proselytes brought along with them to be entered into the covenant of the true God. § 4. They baptized all such infant children of the heathens as they found, or took in war, &c. § 5. The great light that this gives for the better understanding the meaning of our Saviour's commission to baptize the nations, Matth. xxviii. 19. The testimony of St. Ambrose, whose meaning seems to be, that John the Baptist baptized infants. § 6. The Jews called such a proselyte's baptism his *being born again*. Which makes our Saviour's speech to Nicodemus, John iii. 3, 5, more easy to be understood. § 7. A parallel instituted between the Jewish and the Christian baptism. § 8. The arguments of sir Norton Knatchbull, Mr. Stennet, &c., brought to disprove this custom of the Jews, answered.

THE  
CONTENTS OF THE BOOK.

---

PART I.

---

CHAP. I.

*Quotations out of Clemens Romanus and Hermas, p. 29.*

§ 1. Of original sin, as it affects infants, p. 29. § 2. Of the necessity of baptism to salvation, p. 30. § 3. The substance of that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5, *Except one be born of water, &c.* expressed by Hermas before it was written by St. John, p. 32. § 4. The holy men of the Old Testament represented in a vision as baptized into the name of Christ by the apostles, after they were dead. The explication given by the ancients of those texts, 1 Pet. iii. 19, and iv. 6, *of the Gospel being preached to them that were dead*, *ibid.* § 5. Of God's tender regard to infants, p. 33. § 6. That these books of Clemens and Hermas are genuine, p. 34. § 7. That they were written before St. John wrote his Gospel, *ibid.* § 8. But not so soon after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul as bishop Pearson and Mr. Dodwell place them; proved from Irenæus, p. 36. § 9. That this Clement is not probably that Clement mentioned Phil. iv. 3, nor this Hermas he that is named Rom. xvi. 14, p. 38.

CHAP. II.

*Quotations out of Justin Martyr, p. 39.*

§ 1. Of original sin, needing redemption and forgiveness, beside the guilt of actual sins, p. 39. § 2. He speaks of baptism, as being <sup>40.</sup> (A. D. 140.) to us instead of circumcision. Note on Col. ii. 11, 12, p. 40. § 3. The plain and simple way of baptism at that time, p. 41. § 4. They used the word *regeneration* to express baptism; and constantly understand that text, John iii. 5, of water-baptism, p. 43. § 5. The modern writers have altered the sense of the word *regenerated*, *ibid.* § 6. St. Justin speaks of infants made disciples, *ibid.*



## CHAP. III.

*Quotations out of Irenæus, and Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 44.*

§ 1. Irenæus speaks of original sin as affecting all mankind ; and calls  
 67. baptism *redemption*, p. 44. § 2. He expressly reckons infants  
 (A.D. 167.) among those that are *regenerated*, p. 45. § 3. He in all other  
 places uses the word *regenerating* for baptizing, *ibid.* § 4. Several instances  
 shewing that the ancients do use this word for baptism, so as to exclude  
 that conversion or repentance that is not accompanied with baptism, from  
 being signified by it, p. 48. § 5. When infants are said to be *regenerated*,  
 there can in their case be nothing else understood but *baptized*, p. 49.  
 § 6. Of the time when Irenæus wrote, and the country where he was  
 educated : and how impossible it is to conceive that the Christians then  
 should be ignorant, whether in the apostles' time children were baptized or  
 not, *ibid.* § 7. A testimony of any Father is not to be so much regarded,  
 as it speaks his opinion ; as it is for that it gives an evidence of the prac-  
 tice or belief of the church at that time, p. 51. § 8. Clemens Alexandrinus  
 uses the word *regenerate* for *baptized* very commonly : and says at one  
 place, that that word is the name for baptism, *ibid.* § 9. He advises for  
 the sculpture of a seal, the picture of an apostle drawing children out of  
 the water, which must be meant at their baptism, p. 52.

## CHAP. IV.

*Quotations out of Tertullian, p. 54.*

§ 1. A præmonition concerning Tertullian and Origen ; that they were  
 100. guilty of great errors, yet may serve for evidence of the practice  
 (A.D. 200.) of the church at that time. Origen's strange opinion of original  
 sin, that it is derived from sins which the soul has committed before it  
 was united to the body, p. 54. § 2. Tertullian reckons the time or age of  
 one's receiving *baptism* among those questions that are not essential to it,  
 p. 55. § 3. He takes it for a *prescription* or standing rule, ' That none  
 ' can be saved without baptism : ' and answers the objection of the apostles  
 not being baptized : refuting those that say, ' Faith is sufficient for salva-  
 ' tion without baptism,' *ibid.* § 4. He allows laymen to baptize in case of  
 the danger of death ; and says, If they refuse to do it, they are ' guilty of  
 ' the party's perdition,' p. 57. § 5. Speaking of the weightiness of bap-  
 tism, he advises the delay of it in the case of several sorts of persons ; as  
 of infants till they are of age to understand : of unmarried persons and  
 young widows, till the danger of lust be over. And in contradiction to  
 what he had said before, says, ' That an entire faith is secure of salvation.'  
 And of infants says, ' What need has their innocent age to make such haste  
 ' for the forgiveness of sins ? ' p. 58. § 6. He in another book speaks of  
 infants as being *unclean* and *sinful* ; and that they are not holy, nor can

enter into the kingdom of God till they are baptized : contrary to what he said before, p. 59. § 7. An attempt to reconcile these differences in his sayings. He seems to have thought, that in case of danger of death, infants, virgins, widows, &c. must be baptized presently ; otherwise they might better be delayed, *ibid.* § 8. This is agreed to have been his opinion by several both of the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists. The unfair dealing of Rigaltius, to leave out of the last edition (without giving any reason from the MSS.) those words of Tertullian that were in the former edition, which do plainly express this meaning, p. 61. § 9. It appears by his words, that baptism of infants and godfathers for them, were then in use, p. 62. § 10. His absurd comment on Matth. xix. 14, *Suffer little children*, &c. *ibid.* § 11. He says the heathens had a rite of baptizing, and called it *regeneration*, p. 63. § 12. He takes the *holiness* mentioned 1 Cor. vii. 14, for baptismal holiness *designed* to them, *ibid.* § 13. His book of baptism had not come into the hands of most of the learned men of the next centuries : or else they would not quote him, as being an heretic. Yet, St. Hierome had seen it, *ibid.*

## CHAP. V.

*Quotations out of Origen, p. 64.*

§ 1. That infants were then baptized *by the usage of the church*, p. 64.  
 110. § 2. His inquiry for what sins they were baptized, p. 65. § 3.  
 (A.D. 210.) His testimony that the *apostles ordered* infants to be baptized, *ibid.* § 4. Some passages of his that are to this purpose, but are spurious or doubtful, rejected, p. 66. § 5. His homilies on St. Luke were certainly translated by St. Hierome, p. 67. § 6. What credit is to be given to the others that were done by Rufinus, *ibid.* § 7. An objection of Mr. Tombes' against their being authentic, considered. And in what sense Origen laid any foundation for Pelagianism, p. 68. § 8. That Rufinus would never have inserted any thing making for the doctrine of original sin : that his private opinion was against it, p. 69. § 9. He inquires whether the guardian angel given to infants, and spoken of Matth. xviii. 10, be given at their birth or at their baptism, p. 71. § 10. St. Hierome's testimony that Origen spoke of infants' baptism, p. 74. § 11. A passage in his Greek remains, like to the foregoing ones, and from whence infant-baptism is proved, *ibid.* § 12. The advantages that Origen had to know the practice of Christians from the beginning, p. 77.

## CHAP. VI.

*Quotations out of St. Cyprian, p. 78.*

§ 1. The letter written by him and sixty-six bishops in council with him,  
 150. in answer to Fidus, who had asked their opinion, whether an  
 (A.D. 250.) infant might be baptized before he were eight days old, p. 78.

'ment between the Unitarians and the Catholic church,' p. 117. § 13. They explain the divinity of Christ only by God's inhabiting in him, p. 119. § 14. They have altered their notion of the λόγος from one extreme to the other; and yet keep their main article still, of Christ's having no nature but the human, p. 120. § 15. The ill colours they put on the Catholic faith, p. 122. § 16. The progress they boast they should make, if they had a toleration, has no precedent in former ages, p. 124. § 17. Difference in lesser opinions is no bar against communion; but it is otherwise in fundamentals, p. 125. § 18. The mean opinion they have of Christ's satisfaction, p. 127. § 19. The distinct assemblies which they say they will hold for preserving the doctrine of the unity of the Godhead are needless, p. 128. § 20. Their virulent endeavour to blacken the Nicene Creed, *ibid.*

## CHAP. XII.

*Out of St. Basil, p. 130.*

§ 1. An abstract of his sermon persuading people to baptism, p. 130. 260. § 2. Any time of one's life proper for baptism, p. 131. § 3. He (A. D. 360.) speaks to several of his auditory, as having been instructed in Christian religion from infancy, and not yet baptized, *ibid.* § 4. Many at that time were persuaded of the truth of Christian religion, and intended to be baptized into it some time or other, but put it off. These men's children were instructed in it, but not yet baptized; because the parents themselves were not yet baptized, *ibid.* § 5. He proves the necessity of baptism from the threat denounced against an infant that was not circumcised on the eighth day, p. 132. § 6. His pathetical discourse against the delay of repentance and baptism, p. 133. § 7. He tells some people that had wrote to him of baptism, that they must first be instructed, and then admitted to baptism, p. 134. § 8. His explication of John iii. 3, 5, p. 135. § 9. He speaks of boys and little children joining in the Divine offices, *ibid.* § 10. He advises Valens to have his child baptized by the Catholics; but Valens would have it done by the Arians, p. 136. § 11. A disquisition concerning the age of that child, p. 137.

## CHAP. XIII.

*Out of St. Ambrose, p. 138.*

§ 1. He speaks of infant-baptism being in use in his and in the apostles' 274. time, and as supposing it practised by John the Baptist, p. 138. (A. D. 284.) § 2. He makes it a question, whether an infant can be saved without baptism, p. 139.

## CHAP. XIV.

*Out of St. Chrysostom, p. 141.*

§ 1. He says, One in infancy, or one in middle age, or one in old age



287. may receive baptism, p. 101. § 2. He often affirms, that there (A.D. 380.) is no entering the kingdom of heaven without baptism, p. 143. § 3. He says, Infants are baptized, though they have no sins, p. 145. § 4. St. Austin's defence of him against the Pelagians, who challenged him for one of their side, *ibid.* § 5. He speaks of infants as ordinarily baptized, p. 148. § 6. His mention of the sign of the cross made on the infant's forehead at its baptism, *ibid.*

## CHAP. XV.

*Out of St. Hierome and St. Austin, before the rise of the Pelagian controversy.*

SECT. I. *Out of St. Hierome's Letter to Leta*, p. 149.

St. Hierome says, If infants be not baptized, the sin of omitting it is laid to the parent's charge, p. 149.

SECT. II. *Out of St. Austin's book de Sermone Domini in monte*, p. 151.

St. Austin explains those words, 1 Cor. vii. 14. *Now are your children holy*, thus, 'Now are your children baptized,' p. 151.

SECT. III. *Out of St. Austin's books de libero Arbitrio*, p. 153.

§ 1. He makes answer to those that asked, What good baptism does to children before they have any faith, p. 153. § 2. A reflection on that saying of Grotius, that St. Austin, before he was heated by the Pelagian controversy, never wrote any thing of the condemnation of unbaptized infants, p. 154.

SECT. IV. *Out of St. Austin's books de Baptismo, contra Donatistas*, p. 155.

§ 1. St. Austin's way of managing against the Donatists, p. 155. § 2. He proves, that infants or others baptized in the right form, though in a schismatical or heretical church, have their baptism valid, p. 156. § 3. He speaks of infant-baptism as a thing practised by the whole church, and not instituted by any council, but having ever been in use, and ordered by the apostles; and that it is to us instead of circumcision. And though God has commanded both faith and baptism, yet either of them, where the other cannot be had, is available to salvation, p. 157. § 4. The mistake of those who say, The Donatists denied infant-baptism, p. 161.

SECT. V. *Out of St. Austin's Letter to Boniface*, p. 162.

§ 1. He answers the question, How the faith of parents stands their children in stead for their baptism, and yet the apostasy of the parent afterward does not hurt the child, p. 162. § 2. That the validity of the baptism does not depend on the right faith or intention of those that bring the child: the child is supposed to be offered to baptism by the whole congregation that pray for it, p. 164. § 3. That the parents at that time were

usually the godfathers ; but that this office might be done by any other that was owner of the child, p. 165. § 4. In what sense the answer made by the godfather in the name of the child, ‘that he does renounce, believe,’ &c. is to be understood, p. 166. § 5. St. Austin speaks of these questions and answers as necessary, p. 170. § 6. He supposes it to be the belief of all Christians ; that children baptized, and dying before actual sin, are undoubtedly saved, p. 171. He had no notion of transubstantiation, *ibid.* § 8. The custom then to receive the holy communion every day, or at least every Lord’s day, p. 172. § 9. He does not pretend that infants have faith : the opinion of the Lutherans, and the fancy of F. Malebranche on that subject, *ibid.*

SECT. VI. *Out of the books de Genesi ad literam*, p. 176.

§ 1. A debate concerning the origin of the soul ; whether it be by propagation or immediate creation. St. Austin shews that the former agrees best with the doctrine of original sin, p. 176. § 2. The true reading of a place in St. Austin *de Genesi ad lit.* l. x. c. 23. of ‘infant-baptism being ‘ordered by the apostles,’ restored by bishop Stillingfleet out of the MSS. p. 178.

SECT. VII. *Out of St. Austin’s Letter to St. Hierome*, p. 181.

§ 1. St. Austin desires St. Hierome’s opinion, how original sin can be explained if the infant’s soul be anew created, p. 181. § 2. The opinion of some moderns of the nature of the soul ; and of the antipædobaptists concerning the sleep of the soul, p. 186. § 3. Private baptism of children in houses not used in St. Austin’s time, except in cases of the utmost extremity. How much the English presbyterians have changed their sentiments about that matter, p. 188.

CHAP. XVI.

*Quotations out of some councils of Carthage before the Pelagian controversy*, p. 191.

§ 1. The bishops make a question, whether they shall admit to holy orders those who had been in their infancy baptized by the <sup>297.</sup> Donatists, and were since come over to the Catholic church. They ask the opinion of neighbouring bishops, p. 191. § 2. They determine afterwards that such may be admitted, p. 193. § 3. A canon for abating to poor people the fees due for baptizing their children ; but thought to be spurious, p. 194. § 4. A canon made for the case of such as had been in their infancy carried captive into the country of barbarians, and when returned, could not tell whether they had been baptized before their captivity or not ; ordering that such should be baptized, *ibid.* § 5. A canon of a former council of Hippo to the same purpose, p. 197. § 6. A decree afterwards of pope Leo to the same purpose, *ibid.*

## CHAP. XVII.

*Out of the Decretal Epistles of Siricius and Innocentius, bishops of Rome, p. 200.*

§ 1. The gross way of forging decretal epistles for the bishops of Rome  
 284. of the first ages, p. 200. § 2. Siricius' epistles are the first  
 (A.D. 384.) that are genuine, all before him are forged, p. 202. § 3. He declares the order and practice of the churches to be, that none be baptized but at the set and appointed times of the year for baptism, viz. Easter and Whitsuntide; except infants, sick persons, or others that may be in danger of death before that time, *ibid.* § 4. Proof that this epistle is not forged, as the foregoing are, p. 205. § 5. The reason of that order, that no adult person, except in case of necessity, should be baptized but at the times aforesaid: and of the custom of catechising in Lent, p. 206. § 6. He informs the Christians of Spain, that bishops and presbyters ought to be chosen, not out of new converts, but of such as have been baptized in infancy, p. 207. § 7. Innocentius informs Decentius, that though presbyters may baptize infants, only bishops may give them *chrism* or *confirmation*, *ibid.* § 8. He repeats to the council of Toledo the advice of Siricius, that the clergy ought to be chosen, not out of novices, but of such as have been baptized in infancy, p. 208.

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Out of Paulinus bishop of Nola: and another Paulinus, deacon of the church of Milan, p. 209.*

§ 1. An inscription composed to be set over the font, mentioning infants  
 293. there baptized, p. 209. § 2. That all new baptized persons,  
 (A.D. 393.) young or old, were about this time called *infants*, p. 210. § 3. An epitaph made on a child seven years old, mentioning his baptism, p. 211. § 4. Paulinus desires St. Hierome's opinion, how St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 14, calls the children of Christians *holy*, whenas without baptism they cannot be saved, p. 212. § 5. St. Hierome's answer; agreeing, that without baptism they cannot be saved, p. 213. § 6. Paulinus the deacon, in relating St. Ambrose's death, mentions some infants then newly baptized, p. 215.

## CHAP. XIX.

*Out of St. Hierome and St. Austin, after the rise of the Pelagian controversy: as also out of Pelagius, Caelestius, Innocent the First, Zosimus, Julianus, Theodorus Mopsuestensis, &c. and out of the councils of Diospolis, Milevis, Carthage, &c. p. 216.*

§ 1. The occasion the Pelagian controversy gave to speak of infant-  
 310. baptism, p. 216. § 2. The account of this controversy given  
 (A.D. 410.) by Mr. le Clerc is very partial for Pelagius, p. 217. § 3. Pela-

gius was a Briton, not a Scot : and Cælestius an Irishman, p. 219. § 4. They vented their opinion against the doctrine of original sin, at first covertly, and by way of objection, p. 220. § 5. Cælestius being examined at the council of Carthage, anno 412, would not own original sin ; yet granted the necessity of infant-baptism, p. 222. § 6. St. Austin proves against the Pelagians, that infants have sin, because it was acknowledged that they must be baptized, p. 223. § 7. He refutes that evasion of theirs ; that they are baptized not for forgiveness of sins, but to gain them admission into the kingdom of heaven, *ibid.* § 8. And another evasion : that they are baptized for sins committed by their souls in a state of pre-existence, p. 225. § 9. He proves that Christ came to save only such as were in a lost condition ; and that only such are to be baptized, *ibid.* § 10. That there is no middle state between salvation and some degree of damnation, p. 226. § 11. Refutes those that said, Infants have actual sins, as peevishness, &c. and that they are baptized for them. All the Pelagians owned, that infants are to be baptized, *ibid.* § 12. Cælestius owned that infants have redemption by their baptism, but would not say forgiveness, p. 227. § 13. The dispute between the Catholics and Pelagians about the necessity of God's grace, p. 228. § 14. The unfair account of this dispute given by Mr. le Clerc, p. 229. § 15. How far Pelagius owned God's grace, p. 232. § 16. How far he recanted what he had said against it, p. 235. § 17. St. Austin asserts, that the whole church has from of old constantly held, and that he never read or heard of any Christian catholic or sectary, who denied that infants are baptized for forgiveness, p. 236. § 18. How parents that are by baptism cleansed from original sin, do yet beget children liable to it, p. 238. § 19. Several interpretations given by the ancients of that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Now are your children holy*, conferred together, p. 239. § 20. St. Hierome's letter to Ctesiphon. Some blasphemous tenets of the Pelagians: St. Austin's letter to Hilarius, and management of the argument for original sin, from Rom. v., p. 243. § 21. Dispute between St. Austin and the Pelagians, of the possibility of a rich man's being saved, and of the lawfulness of swearing in any case, p. 246. § 22. The sophistical way of arguing used by the Pelagians, p. 249. § 23. Pelagius was the first that ever affirmed the blessed virgin Mary to be sinless, p. 251. § 24. What Pelagius owned, and what he denied, and how he came off in the meeting at Jerusalem, and in the synod of Diospolis. He was forced there to anathematize all those that say, 'unbaptized infants may have eternal life,' p. 252. § 25. The Greek Fathers condemn Pelagianism as well as the Latin. A reflection on some sayings of Chrysostom and Theodoret, p. 256. § 26. St. Hierome shews that Pelagius must either own that the baptism of infants is for forgiveness of sins ; or else he must make two sorts of baptism, one for infants, and another for grown persons : whereas the Constantinopolitan creed had determined that there is *but one baptism*, and that for the for-



givenness of sins, p. 259. § 27. Pelagius openly denies original sin, and explains what he had said at Diospolis in an equivocal sense, p. 262. § 28. Synodical epistles from the councils of Carthage and Milevis, anno 416. to pope Innocent against Pelagius. And Innocent's answer, p. 263. § 29. Pelagius' creed, which he sent to Innocent for his own vindication, recited at large ; wherein he owns that baptism is to be administered to infants with the same words as it is to elder persons, p. 267. § 30. His letter sent at the same time ; wherein he declares he never heard any one Catholic or sectary deny infants' baptism, p. 277. § 31. Cælestius' creed, owning that infants are to be baptized for forgiveness of sins, according to the rule of the universal church ; and yet maintaining, that they have no sin derived from Adam, p. 279. § 32. Pelagius also was at last brought to this contradiction ; that the baptism of infants is for forgiveness of sins ; and yet they have no sin. How he endeavoured to make sense of this, and then gave over disputing, p. 280. § 33. Pope Zosimus first declares for Cælestius ; and sitting in judicature, pronounces his creed (wherein he denied original sin) to be catholic ; and afterwards condemns both him and his doctrine, and confesses all persons to be under the bond of original sin till they be baptized. His letters *pro et contra* on this subject, p. 282. § 34. St. Austin's charitable endeavour to salve the credit of Zosimus, p. 286. § 35. Cælestius pleads, that so long as one gives baptism to infants, the question whether they have original sin, or not, is not a fundamental one ; and a mistake in that is no heresy. St. Austin holds the contrary, p. 287. § 36. How great opportunities Pelagius and Cælestius had, to know whether there were any Christians in the world that denied infants' baptism ; and how much it had been their interest to mention them, if there had been any such, p. 288. § 37. The second canon of the council of Carthage, anno 418, condemning the Pelagians, who said, Infants were to be baptized for forgiveness of sin, and yet that they had no original sin, p. 289. § 38. Julian continues the dispute with St. Austin after Pelagius was condemned. He pretending that the catholics had gone about to make the people believe that he denied baptism to infants, anathematizes any that deny it, p. 292. § 39. A new device of Theodorus bishop of Mopsuestia, to reconcile these two things ; that infants are to be baptized for forgiveness of sin, and yet that they have none, p. 295. § 40. The tenets of the Semipelagians concerning God's decree about infants obtaining baptism, viz. which shall partake of it, and which not, p. 296.

## CHAP. XX.

*Out of St. Austin and Vincentius Victor, p. 298.*

§ 1. The time when Vincentius published his new Hypothesis, p. 298.  
 § 2. The substance of it, viz. that unbaptized infants should be  
 (A. D. 418.) admitted to paradise, though not to heaven : with St. Austin's  
 answer, p. 299. § 3. He adds something more to it, viz. that they may  
 possibly go to heaven, but not till the resurrection. St. Austin's answer.

The practice of those times in praying for the dead, p. 302. § 4. The mistake of a late writer in thinking that Vincentius denied infants' baptism, p. 304. § 5. Vincentius recants what he had written, p. 305. § 6. A clause that in some copies is added to the second canon of the council of Carthage, anno 418, and a conjecture at the reason why some copies have this clause, and others not, *ibid.*

## CHAP. XXI.

*Irenæus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, St. Austin, and Theodoret, who wrote each of them catalogues of all the sects of Christians that they had heard of, do none of them mention any that denied infants' baptism, p. 308.*

§ 1. The Donatists, Arians, Pelagians, and all other sects that St. Austin  
67 to 350. or Pelagius had heard or read of, if they were such as used any  
(A.D. baptism at all, did use to give it to infants, p. 308. § 2. The  
167 to 450.) sects recited by Irenæus; their monstrous tenets about the  
Deity; the reason of inserting that clause into the creed, 'the Maker of  
heaven and earth.' What they held singular about baptism, p. 309. § 3.  
Of some sects that baptized people after they were dead, and others that  
baptized a living person in the name of another that was dead: the vari-  
ous interpretations given by the ancients and moderns of that saying of  
St. Paul, *Why are they then baptized for the dead?* p. 312. § 4. No sect  
is said to have had any difference with the church about the baptizing of  
infants; but the Pelagians differed in their opinion about the effects of it  
in infants, p. 315. § 5. Of the Hieracites, who held that no infant can go  
to heaven. They thought it unlawful to marry or get children, p. 317.

## CHAP. XXII.

*Containing references to the books of some authors of the next succeeding age, p. 319.*

They do all speak of infant-baptism as a thing taken for granted. A  
300 to 400. story that will shame our merchants that take no care of in-  
(A.D. structing and baptizing their negroes, p. 323.  
400 to 500.)

## CHAP. XXIII.

*Quotations out of some books that are spurious, i. e. not written by those whose names they bear; but yet are proved to be ancient, p. 324.*

§ 1. Out of Clement's Constitutions, ordering Christians to baptize  
300. their infants; with some account of that book, p. 324. § 2.  
(A.D. 400.) Out of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Dionysius the Areopagite;  
answering the objections of the heathens, who derided the Christians for  
baptizing infants, and for their use of godfathers, p. 326. § 3. Out of the  
*Questiones ad Orthodoxos* ascribed to Justin Martyr, and the *Questiones*  
*ad Antiochum* ascribed to Athanasius, concerning the future state of  
infants of the heathens, and of the infants of Christians dying unbaptized,  
p. 329.

## PART II.

## CHAP. I.

*Of some other passages which are by some quoted and pretended to be to this purpose, but are not.*

§ 1. Some are out of spurious books, lately forged, p. 332. § 2. Some nothing to the purpose, *ibid.* § 3. Some wrested and altered, p. 335. § 4. Some not the author's own words, but conclusions unfairly drawn and set down as the author's words, p. 336. § 5. Some absolutely false : instances of each of these sorts of quotations, p. 337.

## CHAP. II.

*The opinions of modern learned men concerning the ancient practice or omission of pædobaptism.*

§ 1. They do almost all conclude, that it was the general practice to baptize infants : some few think that this was not at all practised at the first ; and others, that it was at first held to be indifferent, p. 339. § 2. The opinion of Walafridus Strabo, *ibid.* § 3. Of Ludovicus Vives, p. 341. § 4. Of Curcellæus, p. 342. § 5. Of Rigaltius, p. 343. § 6. Of bishop Jeremy Taylor. He himself answered the arguments he had brought in his *Liberty of Prophesying* against the antiquity of infant-baptism, p. 345. § 7. Of Dr. Barlow bishop of Lincoln, p. 348. § 8. Of Bilius, and Salamasius, p. 349. § 9. Of Hugo Grotius. He was the author of the opinion, that it was held indifferent, p. 351. § 10. Bishop Taylor also judges it to have been accounted indifferent, p. 353. § 11. Of Mr. Thorndyke, p. 355. § 12. Of Mr. Daillé, *ibid.* § 13. Of Mr. Baxter and some remonstrants, *ibid.* § 14. Of Garnier the Jesuit, p. 356. Of Boemus, Macaire, and Dr. Holland, p. 357. § 15. Of Mr. Tombes, Mr. Danvers, Mr. Wills, p. 358. § 16. Most of the modern learned men that have concluded infant-baptism to have been either not from the beginning, or not universal, have been brought to this concession by the instances of several ancients, who are pretended to have been born of Christian parents, and yet not baptized in infancy, p. 359.

## CHAP. III.

*Of those who are said to have been born of Christian parents, and yet not baptized till of man's age.*

SECT. I. *An account of the persons, and state of their case, p. 361.*

SECT. II. *Of Constantine, and Constantius his son, p. 363.*

*That they were not born of baptized parents.*

§ 1. Constantine was not baptized till just before his death, p. 363.

§ 2. His father was not a Christian, p. 364. Nor his mother, when he was born, p. 366. § 3. Constantius' parents were not baptized Christians when he was born, nor a long time after, p. 367.

SECT. III. *Of Gratian and Valentinian the second*, p. 369.

*There is no proof that their father was a baptized Christian when they were born.*

§ 1. The history of their father, p. 369. § 2. The time of the birth and death of each of them, p. 370. § 3. Valentinian desired baptism before his death, but missed of it, p. 372. § 4. Gratian probably was baptized, but not in infancy, p. 374. § 5. Their father does not appear to have been baptized himself, till a little before his death, when the youngest of them was eight years old, *ibid.*

SECT. IV. *Of Theodosius the first*, p. 375.

§ 1. He was not baptized till after he was emperor, p. 375. § 2. His father was not a baptized Christian till he (the son) was twenty-five years old, *ibid.*

SECT. V. *Of St. Basil*, p. 376.

*There is no proof to the contrary, but that he was baptized in infancy.*

§ 1. The quotations brought by Mr. Danvers for his baptism at his adult age, are some of them forged, others unfairly recited, p. 376. § 2. Amphilochius' life of St. Basil, from whence this story is fetched, is a forged piece, p. 377. § 3. Nazianzen Nyssen, and Ephraim Syrus, writing the passages of his life, have no such thing, *ibid.* § 4. The same man that baptized him, did afterward give him ordination, p. 378.

SECT. VI. *Of St. Gregory Nazianzen*, p. 378.

*He was not baptized in infancy, though probably born of baptized parents.*

§ 1. An account when he was baptized, p. 378. § 2. His father was not a Christian till the year 325, p. 379. § 3. The old account is, that the son was born anno 300, which is contradicted by Baronius, p. 380. § 4. Papebrochius resettles the old account, and answers Baronius, *ibid.* § 5. A quotation out of Gregory himself, that he was born after that his father was in orders, p. 382. § 6. Some other reasons on each side examined, p. 383. § 7. An inquiry when his sister Gorgonia and brother Cæsarius were baptized, p. 385.

SECT. VII. *Of Nectarius*, p. 387.

§ 1. He was elected bishop before he was baptized, p. 387. § 2. There is not the least pretence that his parents were Christians, p. 388.



SECT. VIII. *Of St. Chrysostom, p. 388.*

*His parents were probably heathens at the time of his birth.*

§ 1. Ancient historians do say they were, p. 388. § 2. Grotius, without giving any reason, affirms the contrary, p. 389. § 3. Proof out of Sozomen, that Chrysostom himself was for some time a heathen, p. 390. § 4. M. Du Pin's quotations on this subject examined, p. 391.

SECT. IX. *Of St. Ambrose, p. 391.*

*There is no account of his parents being Christians at the time of his birth.*

§ 1. He was chosen for bishop before he was baptized, p. 391. § 2. There is no proof that his parents were Christians at the time of his birth, p. 392. § 3. There is very probable proof from his own words of the contrary, p. 393.

SECT. X. *There is no proof to the contrary, but that St. Hierome was baptized in infancy, p. 394.*

§ 1. Erasmus thought he was baptized at Rome, because he says he there took on him *the garment of Christ*, p. 395. § 2. St. Hierome by that phrase means *the monk's habit*, *ibid.* § 3. Baronius' reason to the contrary considered, p. 397. § 4. The objection taken from his ordination answered, p. 398. § 5. The state of the monastic life at that time, p. 401. St. Hierome's excessive value for it, *ibid.*

SECT. XI. *Of St. Austin, p. 403.*

*His father was a heathen when he was born, and a long time after.*

§ 1. He was thirty-three years old when he was baptized, p. 403. § 2. His father did not turn Christian till he (St. Austin) was seventeen years old, *ibid.* § 3. St. Austin was a Manichee, and then a deist, before he was a Christian, p. 406.

SECT. XII. *Of Monica, Adeodatus, Alypius, and some others. They do none of them make instances to this purpose, p. 406.*

§ 1. It is not known whether Monica were born of Christian parents, and baptized in infancy, or of heathens, and baptized at years of discretion, p. 406. § 2. St. Austin was no Christian when his son Adeodatus was born : as soon as he was baptized himself, he got his son baptized, 407. § 3. Alypius was a heathen first, and then a Christian, *ibid.* § 4. A reflection on Mr. Delaune's quotations against infant-baptism, taken out of Danvers, p. 86. p. 408.

## CHAP. IV.

*Of the church of the ancient Britons, and of the sects of the Novatians and Donatists, which are by some thought to have been antipædobaptists. And of the Arians, p. 409.*

§ 1. Danvers' proof from Fabian's Chronicle, that the ancient Britons were against infant-baptism, is grounded on the misprinting of two or three words in one edition of that book: the contrary proved, p. 410. § 2. The pretence that the Novatians and Donatists denied infants' baptism, has no proof: there is proof to the contrary, p. 411. § 3. The Arians called anabaptists: not that they disliked infant-baptism, but because they rebaptized all that had been baptized by the catholics, p. 414.

## CHAP. V.

*Of some heretics that denied all water-baptism: and of others that gave baptism several times to the same person. The dispute in the catholic church about rebaptizing. Of the Paulianists, whom the Nicene Fathers ordered to be baptized anew, if they would come into the church. The revenge which the modern Paulianists take on those Fathers, by accusing them of Tritheism. The falseness of that accusation, p. 415.*

§ 1. The Valentinians, some of them, renounced all external baptism; others profaned it by their alterations of the form, &c. Their several tenets concerning it out of Irenæus, p. 415. § 2. Quintilla preached at Carthage in the second century, that water-baptism is needless; faith alone is enough, p. 416. § 3. The Manichees held, that baptism in water does nobody any good, p. 417. § 4. The Messalians held the same, being a distracted sort of people, *ibid.* And so did the Ascodyti, Archontici, and Seleucians, or Hermians, p. 419. § 5. The Marcionites of old, and the Muscovites of late, the only persons in the world that ever owned formal anabaptism, or rebaptization of the same person several times, *ibid.* § 6. The dispute among the catholics, whether baptism given by heretics be valid, or must be reiterated. Baptism given in the right form of words, though by heretics, adjudged valid, p. 420. § 7. The Paulianists excepted by the council of Nice from the number of heretics that were to have this privilege, p. 421. § 8. The modern Paulianists do, in revenge, accuse the Nicene and other Fathers of Tritheism: and that they held not a numerical, but only a specifical, unity of the divine essence, p. 422. § 9. They persist in affirming this as proved by Curcellæus, after that all the instances produced by Curcellæus had been by bishop Stillingfleet shewed to be mistakes. The open affront given by Mr. Le Clerc to all the churches that own the Nicene creed, p. 423. § 10. The new instances they bring from Tertullian, answered, p. 424. § 11. And those they bring from Gregory Nazianzen, p. 427. § 12. The heresies of Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius on one side, and Philoponus on the other; and the way the churchmen take to refute them; do plainly shew that the church held the

numerical unity, p. 431. § 13. St. Austin, St. Hierome, St. Ambrose, &c. do express fully the numerical unity of the essence : but these are blackened on other accounts, p. 435. § 14. The mischief brought on the credit of Christian religion, by vilifying the ancient professors of it, because their sayings cannot be brought to serve a turn, p. 436. § 15. St. Austin also in a late piece is made a Tritheist, p. 438. § 16. St. Hilary vindicated from the same imputation, p. 440.

## CHAP. VI.

*The opinions of the ancients concerning the future state of infants. and other persons that happened to die unbaptized, p. 443.*

§ 1. They do all understand that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5, *Except one be born again, &c.*, of water-baptism. Calvin's new interpretation of that text ; and the advantage which the antipædobaptists do take of it. Also they do all by *the kingdom of God* in that text, understand the kingdom of glory. The inconsistency of some later interpretations with the words of the text, p. 444. § 2. Their opinion of the case of martyrs dying unbaptized, that they went to heaven, p. 449. § 3. The case of converts believing, but dying unbaptized. Those that had contemned or neglected baptism, condemned. Those that had fully resolved to take it, but missed of it, went, as some thought, to a middle state ; as others thought to heaven, p. 450. § 4. Of infants dying unbaptized. All agree that they miss of the kingdom of heaven. They go, as the Greek Fathers think, into a middle state ; as others, into some degree of punishment, p. 454. § 5. Of the degree of their punishment. St. Austin thinks it to be a very moderate one ; a state better than no being at all, p. 456. The books in which the more rigid opinion is held, are Fulgentius' and not his, p. 458. § 6. The opinions of the following ages. Fulgentius, anno 500 ; Pope Gregory, 600 ; Anselm, 1000 ; do speak of their being tormented, p. 459. The schoolmen, anno 1200, go over to the opinion of the Greek church, that they shall be in a middle state, p. 460. The council of Trent were about to determine the opinion of their being tormented, to be a heresy, p. 462. § 7. Some in the middle age have conceived hopes of some unbaptized infants going to heaven. Hincmarus Rhemensis, *ibid.* Wickliffe, p. 463, the Lollards, Hussites, &c. p. 466, (and the schoolmen for infants dying in the womb) and in the latter times, Cajetan and Cassander, p. 467. § 8. The opinions of the protestants, Lutherans, Calvinists, Church of England, English presbyterians, antipædobaptists, concerning the possibility of salvation of unbaptized infants, p. 468. § 9. That all baptized infants, dying such, are saved ; the generality of the Christian world has agreed, p. 471. The ancient Prædestinarians, and Semipelagians, consented in this. Of the modern Prædestinarians, some few have doubted or denied it, p. 473. § 10. The ancients never refused to baptize a child on account of the parents' wickedness, as some Calvinists now do, p. 474.

## CHAP. VII.

*An account of the state of this practice from the year 400 till the rise of the German antipædobaptists. Of the Waldenses ; and their chief accusers, St. Bernard, Petrus Cluniacensis, Reynierius, Pilichdorf, &c. The confessions of the Waldenses themselves, p. 475.*

§ 1. There are no pretences of any one in this period, before the time of the Waldenses, being against infant-baptism, but what are proved to be mistakes, p. 475. The instance of Hincmarus, bishop of Laudun, shewn to be such, p. 476. § 2. Of Bruno bishop of Angiers, and of Berengarius archdeacon of the same church, there are reports, that they held doctrines that do overthrow infant-baptism ; but they never owned any such, p. 477. § 3. A general account of the Waldenses, anno 1150. What the popish historians do say of their tenets. What the present remainders of them do say of their ancestors. Some of their old *Confessions*. The present debate, whether they were anciently pædobaptists or antipædobaptists, p. 480. § 4. That there were several sects of those men, whom we now call by that general name *Waldenses* ; and that some of them denied all water-baptism. The distinct account of their several tenets about baptism, given by Reynierius, &c., p. 485. § 5. That one sect of them, viz. the Petrobrusians, otherwise called *Henricians*, did own water-baptism and yet deny infant-baptism, p. 490. Four witnesses of this. The Lateran councils under Innocent the Second and Innocent the Third, p. 496. Mr. Stennet's pretence to the disciples of Gundulphus, anno 1025, examined, p. 495. § 6. That all the rest of them owned infant-baptism, p. 497. § 7. Those that denied it, quickly dwindled away, or came over to those that owned it, p. 498. § 8. The life of Peter Bruis, and Henry, the two first antipædobaptist preachers in the world, p. 501.

## CHAP. VIII.

*The present state of this controversy. That all the national churches in the world are pædobaptists. Of the antipædobaptists that are in Germany, Holland, England, Poland, and Transylvania, p. 504.*

§ 1. All the national churches in Europe are pædobaptists, p. 505. § 2. So are those in Asia, p. 506. A disquisition concerning the Georgians ; of whom sir Paul Ricaut had heard, that they held formerly, that children ought not to be baptized till the age of fourteen, and that they now hold, that they are not to be baptized till eight years old. The mistake of this report shewed from sir John Chardin, who travelled in that country. Of the Armenians, Jacobites, Maronites, Christians of St. Thomas, &c. They do all baptize infants, p. 510. § 3. The two sorts of Christians that are in Africa, viz. the Cophti and Abassens, do both of them baptize their infants forty days after their birth or circumcision. A mistake in the print of Mr. Thevenot concerning what he heard by the



relation of an ambassador from the Abassens, that before the Jesuits came there, they did not use to baptize till forty years, putting *years* for *days*, p. 512. § 4. Of the antipædobaptists in Germany, anno 1522. An inquiry whether that opinion was then set up anew, or had been continued from the time of the Petrobrusians, p. 513. A letter written to Erasmus, anno 1519, concerning the Pyghards, p. 515. § 5. Of those in Holland and the Low Countries; their insurrection at Amsterdam. Of Menno, and the present Minnists; their tenets, &c., p. 518. § 6. Of the English antipædobaptists. Some Dutchmen in England, but no Englishmen, of this way in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, p. 528. No considerable number of English till the times of the rebellion, *ibid.* The great encouragement given them by Oliver Cromwell. Their great increase at that time, p. 529. The present state of them, p. 533. Their tenets concerning, 1. Separation. 2. Immersion. Their reasons for the necessity of it. The word βαπτίζω does not include dipping in its signification, p. 534. 3. Baptizing naked. 4. The form of baptism. 5. The flesh of Christ, p. 540. 6. The millennium. 7. Eating of blood. 8. Sleep of the soul. The opinion of the ancients concerning Hades, and the state of souls in it, p. 545. 9. Singing of Psalms, p. 551. 10. The use of the Lord's Prayer. 11. Extreme unction. 12. Way of marriage. 13. Posture in receiving the Lord's Supper. 14. The Saturday-sabbath. 15. Confirmation, or laying on of hands. 16. Prædestination. 17. Original sin. 18. The divinity of Christ, p. 555. 19. Their disputes with the Quakers. 20. Their church officers. 21. Their way of adjusting differences in money matters. 22. Church discipline against scandalous members. 23. Of the Jesuits creeping in among them, p. 562. Bishop Stillingfleet's sagacity in discovering Hallingham, Coleman, and Benson, to have been Jesuits. Of one Everard, a papist, who having got in Cromwell's time a commission for a troop of horse, set up for a preacher against infant-baptism. All the papists do of late years industriously put it into their books, that infant-baptism cannot be proved from Scripture. The weakness of some late antipædobaptists, in valuing themselves on the papists thus siding with them in the dispute, p. 566. § 7. Of the antipædobaptists in Poland, Hungary, Transylvania, &c. Those that were formerly in Poland were mostly Socinians; and so are they that are at present in Transylvania. p. 568.

## CHAP. IX.

*The ancient rites of baptism, p. 570.*

§ 1. The adult used prayer and fasting before it, p. 570. § 2. The ordinary way of baptizing was by immersion; but in case of sickness, &c. they gave it by affusion of water on the face. Some ancient proofs of this from a letter of St. Cyprian. The examples of Novatian, St. Laurence, Basilides, the jailor, in Acts xvi. &c. *ibid.* An account of the times when

immersion was left off in the Latin church : France was the first country in Christendom that left it off : then Italy, Germany, &c. p. 576 ; and last of all, England, not till the time of queen Elizabeth, p. 580. The Directory forbids dipping, p. 582. The church of England at the Restoration re-established it, in case the child be able to bear it, p. 583. The opinion of Mr. Mede, bishop Taylor, Mr. Rogers, sir Norton Knatchbull, Mr. Walker, Dr. Towerson, Dr. Whitby, sir John Floyer, &c., that the general use of it ought to be restored, p. 585. All nations of Christians in the world, except those that are or have been under the pope, do *dip* their infants, if in health, p. 589. § 3. The ancient Christians baptized naked. The care that was taken to preserve the modesty of women, p. 591. § 4. The head of the baptized was thrice put under water ; once at the naming each name of the holy Trinity, p. 592. § 5. The forehead was signed with the sign of the cross, p. 595. § 6. A mixture of milk and honey given to the new-baptized person. A quotation out of the epistle of Barnabas to that purpose, p. 596. § 7. The white garment put on after baptism, p. 598. § 8. Of the two anointings ; one with oil before the baptism ; the other with a rich ointment or chrism after baptism, together with the laying on of hands of the bishop, *ibid.* § 9. The professions made at baptism, both of the adult and infants : and first, the promise of renouncing the Devil and all wickedness, p. 601. § 10. The profession of faith : the form of it at first ; only to say, ‘ I believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the ‘ Holy Spirit.’ It was afterwards made in the words of the creed that was in use in each church. The copies of the most ancient creeds are lost. The substance of them collected from rules of faith delivered by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, &c. p. 604. § 11. The Nicene creed the eldest copy of any public creed that is extant. Eusebius’ creed ; the creed of Alexander ; of Arius ; of some Arian councils at Antioch ; of Eunomius. Julian the apostate’s applause of Photinus’ belief. The abhorrence expressed by the Arians, as well as Catholics, against it. All the Catholic Christians of the East used the Nicene creed at baptism, p. 611. § 12. The Constantinopolitan creed. What is added to the Nicene. Of the sense of those words, 2 Cor. iii. 17, *ὁ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι*, p. 618. § 13. The Roman creed : no copy of it extant, elder than the year 400 : what clauses have been added to it since that time : the descent into hell, &c., and how it came to be called the *Apostlic* creed, or the *Apostles’ creed*, p. 621. § 14. The baptismal professions made twice by the adult ; but once in the case of infants. Infants never ordinarily baptized without godfathers making profession in their name, p. 627. § 15. The eucharist given quickly after baptism : always to the adult, and in some places and ages of the church, to infants. Mr. Daillé’s charge against the ancients for doing this, examined. No proof of its being given to mere infants, till after the year 400. The mistake of those that say St. Austin calls it an apostolical tradition, p. 628. § 16. This custom continued in the church

of Rome from 400 to 1000. It was then dropt on account of the doctrine of transubstantiation coming up. The contrary determinations of pope Innocent and pope Pius about the necessity of it, p. 634. The Greeks in later times took it from the Latins, and not being disturbed by the doctrine of transubstantiation, do practise it still, p. 636. § 17. The argument of the antipædobaptists against any regard to be given to the practice of the ancients in other matters, because they were in an error in this matter, proposed and considered, *ibid*.

## CHAP. X.

*A summing up of the evidence that has here been given on both sides, p. 638.*

§ 1. Evidence for infants' baptism, p. 638. § 2. Evidence against infants' baptism, p. 644. § 3. Evidence that seems to make against infant-baptism, but does not really, p. 647.

## CHAP. XI.

*A dissuasive from separation on account of the difference of opinion about the age or time of receiving baptism, p. 657.*

§ 1. The great guilt and mischief of the sin of schism, p. 658. § 2. Different opinions in points not fundamental, no just cause of separation. The fault of the Romish way of bringing all men to unity, by forcing them to subscribe to the same opinions, and of the way in the opposite extreme of setting up several churches for the several opinions, p. 659. § 3. He that likes some other way of ordering the public worship, ceremonies, &c., better than that which is established in the church where he lives, is not therefore to separate, p. 665. § 4. He that thinks some error, not fundamental, to be expressed in some of the prayers, collects, &c., ought to join in the other service, though he cannot join in those particular prayers, provided there be no idolatry in any part of the worship, p. 669. § 5. In the Scripture-command of holding communion with the church where we live, there are but four cases excepted : 1. Idolatry ; 2. False doctrine in fundamentals ; 3. The church's requiring some condition of communion that is sinful ; 4. If that church herself be schismatical. He that adds any more exceptions, adds to the Scripture, p. 671. § 6. An error in opinion about the age or manner of receiving baptism, is not a fundamental one, p. 672. § 7. Some difficulties on the part of the church of England in receiving antipædobaptists to communion ; and some on the antipædobaptists' side, in accepting communion with the said church, considered. They are none of them such as to render the said communion impracticable, p. 682. An alphabetical table of some few matters, p. 690.





## THE INTRODUCTION.

---

§ I. **THE** meaning and full import of a rule given in any old book for the doing of any thing is not so well apprehended by us, unless we understand the history of that nation and of that time in which the said rule was given. And this holds especially for such rules as are expressed in very short and general words.

For it is common for a rule or law to be so worded, as that one may perceive that the lawgiver has supposed or taken for granted, that the people to whom it was given, did already know and understand some things which were previous to the apprehending of his meaning; so that it was needless to express them. But though these things were ordinarily known to the people of that time and place, yet we that live at so great a distance of time do not know them, without an inquiry made into the history of the state of that time, as to those things which the law speaks of: and consequently without such inquiry the law or rule, that was plain to them, will in many particulars be obscure to us. So, for example, many of the Grecian and Roman laws, whereof we have copies yet extant, would not be well understood by us, unless they were explained to us by such as have skill in the history of the state of affairs in those empires. And so many passages in the books of the New Testament of our Saviour Christ are not rightly apprehended, without having recourse to the books of the Old Testament, and other books wherein the customs of the Jewish nation are set forth, for understanding the state of religion among that people at that time when our Saviour gave his rules.

And another thing that does much help us in understanding the meaning of any such old law that is given in such short words, is, to observe and learn how the men that lived in or so near that time, that the meaning of the lawgiver must easily be known by them, did practise it. For in what particulars soever we may doubt how or in what manner it is to be executed, their actions and declarations do serve as precedents to us upon the said law. And this holds especially in such laws as have been in continual use from the time of their enacting to this time.

Now our Saviour's law concerning baptizing all the nations is, as I shewed in the preface, set down in scripture in very short and general words: and many people of later times have doubted whether it is to be understood to reach to the baptizing of infants, or only of adult persons. All that have any doubt ought to have recourse to the two several helps for understanding the said law which I have here proposed.

I mean, they ought to learn as well as they can, what was the state of the Jewish religion as to baptism, at and before that time when our Saviour gave his order for baptizing all the nations; and what we must suppose the apostles did of themselves already know concerning its being proper or improper for infants; which it might not be so needful for our Saviour to express in his new direction to them.

And also they ought to learn as well as they can, how the first Christians did practise in this matter; whether they baptized their infants or not.

It is the latter of these two things that I have taken upon me as my task to shew; viz. how the primitive Christians did practise: and this I do by giving you their own words, without omitting any that I know of for the first 400 years after Christ.

But yet some knowledge of the other point also (viz. how the Jews in and before our Saviour's time did use to act in reference to the baptizing of infants) is so very necessary to a right understanding of the words both of our Saviour and his apostles, and also of the primitive Christians; and he that knows nothing of it, is so incompetent a judge of the force of their sayings; that I think it needful for the use of ordinary readers, to premise, by way of introduction, some account of that matter also.

But I do not pretend in this introduction, in which I treat of the custom of the Jews in baptizing infants before our Saviour's time, to do as I do in the book itself, wherein I treat of the custom of the Christians in baptizing them after it; that is, to recite all the authorities that are about that matter. Partly because the quotations for that purpose are to be searched for in books with which I am not so well acquainted; and partly because those few which I shall produce, will make it clear enough that there was such a custom. I shall therefore content myself with reciting such of them as have been already made use of by learned men: such as Ainsworth on Gen. xvii: Dr. Hammond's Annotations on Matt. iii. xix. xxiii: John iii: item, Six Queries: item, Defence of Infant Baptism: Selden de Jure Nat. et Gent. juxta Hebræos: item, de Synedriis:

item, de Successionibus, &c.: Dr. Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. on Matt. iii. and John iii: item, Harmony on the New Testament: Luke iii. Jacob Alting, Prælectio 7. de Proselytis: Godwyn's Moses and Aaron, &c.: and the learned author of the Discourse concerning Lent<sup>a</sup>, part ii. chap. 2.

First, then, it is evident that the custom of the Jews before our Saviour's time (and, as they themselves affirm, from the beginning of their law) was to baptize as well as circumcise any proselyte that came over to them from the nations. This does fully appear both from the books of the Jews themselves, and also of others that understood the Jewish customs and have written of them. They reckoned all mankind beside themselves to be in an unclean state, and not capable of being entered into the covenant of Israelites without a washing or baptism, to denote their purification from their uncleanness. And this was called the baptizing of them unto Moses.

This custom of theirs is fully and largely set forth by

*Maimonides; Issuri Bia*, capp. 13, 14.

He had been saying there that the Israelites themselves were entered into covenant by circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. And then he adds:

‘And so in all ages when an ethnic is willing to enter into the covenant, and gather himself under the wings of the majesty of God, and take upon him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a sacrifice; or if it be a woman, be baptized and bring a sacrifice. As it is written<sup>b</sup>, *As you are, so shall the stranger be*. How are you? By circumcision and baptism, and bringing of a sacrifice. So likewise the stranger (or proselyte) through all generations; by circumcision and baptism, and bringing of a sacrifice. And what is the stranger's sacrifice? A burnt offering of a beast, or two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, both of them for a burnt offering.

‘And at this time, when there is no sacrificing, they must be circumcised and baptized; and when the temple shall be built, they are to bring the sacrifice.

‘A stranger that is circumcised and not baptized, or baptized and not circumcised, he is not a proselyte till he be both circumcised and baptized: and he must be baptized in the presence of three, &c.

‘Even as they circumcise and baptize strangers; so do they cir-

<sup>a</sup> A Discourse concerning Lent, in two parts, (published anonymously, but by Dr. George Hooper, bishop of Bath and Wells,) 8vo. London, 1695. <sup>b</sup> Numb. xv. 15.

‘ cumcise and baptize servants that are received from heathens into the name of servitude, &c.

‘ When a man or a woman comes to join as a proselyte, they make diligent inquiry concerning such, lest they come to get themselves under the law for some riches that they should receive, or for dignity that they should obtain, or for fear. If it be a man, they inquire whether he have not set his affection on some Jewish woman; or a woman, her affection on some young man of Israel. If no such like occasion be found in them, they make known unto them the weightiness of the yoke of the law and the toil that is in the doing thereof, above that which people of other lands have, to see if they will go back. If they take it upon them and withdraw not, and they see that they come of love, then they receive them, &c.

‘ Therefore the judges received no proselyte all the days of David and Solomon. Not in David’s days, lest they should have come of fear: nor in Solomon’s, lest they should have come because of the kingdom and great prosperity which Israel then had. For whoso comes from the heathens for any thing of the vanities of this world, he is no righteous proselyte. Notwithstanding there were many proselytes that in David’s and Solomon’s time joined themselves in the presence of private persons; and the judges of the great Synedrion had a care of them. They drove them not away, after they were baptized, out of any place; neither took they them near to them, until their after-fruits appeared.’

Maimonides gives at the same place an account of several circumstances of time, place, &c., observed in this action of baptizing a proselyte. As that, ‘ they baptized not a proselyte on the sabbath, nor on a holyday, nor by night, &c. They do it in a confluence of waters, &c. As soon as he grows whole of the wound of circumcision, they bring him to baptism; and being placed in the water they again instruct him,’ &c. And such a confluence of waters, Jonathan’s Chaldee Paraphrase determines ought not to be less than forty of the measures called Sata, where he paraphrases on Exod. xxix. Lev. xi. and other places.

The Talmud says the same thing of receiving proselytes by baptism; only, whereas Maimonides speaks of the number of three as necessary to be present at the baptizing; the Talmud Babylon. does not insist on any more than two grave men.

*Talmud Babylon. Mass. Jevamoth. fol. 47.*

‘ When a proselyte is received, he must be circumcised; and then when he is cured (of the wound of circumcision) they baptize him



‘in the presence of two wise men, saying, Behold he is an Israelite in all things: or if it be a woman, the women lead her to the waters,’ &c.

But the Talmud Hierosol. Jevamoth says as Maimonides does, that ‘a proselyte has need of three<sup>c</sup>.’ And directs the other circumstances as he does, viz. ‘They do not baptize a proselyte by night<sup>d</sup>.’ And, ‘they were not baptized till the pain of circumcision were healed<sup>e</sup>.’

And the same continues to this day to be the practice of the present Jews. For so Leo Modena<sup>f</sup>, in his history of them, part v. chap. 2, speaking of a proselyte’s admission; ‘They take and circumcise him; and as soon as he is well of his sore, he is to wash himself all over in water: and this is to be done in the presence of the three rabbins, &c. And so, from thenceforth, he becomes as a natural Jew.’

The books do speak of this washing, or baptism, as absolutely necessary; and an ordinance, without which none was to be counted a proselyte. So

*Gemara Babylon. ad tit. Cherithoth, cap. ii.*

‘The proselytes entered not into covenant, but by circumcision, baptism, and sprinkling of blood.’

*And Tit. Jabimoth, cap. iv.*

‘He is no proselyte unless he be circumcised and baptized.’ And ‘if he be not baptized, he remains a Gentile’ (or Pagan). And there is in that chapter a proof given of that opinion of the necessity, which I shall have occasion by and by to mention.

Maimonides says the same thing, as we saw in the chapter I quoted before<sup>g</sup>.

Also the Talmud, Tract. Repudii, speaking of Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law:

‘He was made a proselyte by circumcision and ‘immersion in waters.’ Godwyn, in his Moses and Aaron, lib. i. cap. 3.

To the making of a male proselyte at first three things were required: 1. circumcision; 2. a kind of purification by water; 3. the blood of oblation. Moses Kotsen<sup>h</sup>, fol. 20. Of a woman proselyte were required only purification by water, and oblation, Drusius<sup>i</sup> de tribus Sectis.

<sup>c</sup> Fol. 46. 2.    <sup>d</sup> Ibid.    <sup>e</sup> Fol. 41. 2.

<sup>f</sup> The History of the Rites, Customs, and Manner of Life of the present Jews throughout the World; translated (from the Italian) into English, by Edmund Chilmead. 12mo. London, 1650.

<sup>g</sup> Issuri Bia, c. 13.

<sup>h</sup> Rabbi Moses ben Jacob Kotsiensis, ‘Liber Præceptorum magnus,’ fol. Venetiis, 1522. ibid. 1547.

<sup>i</sup> Johannes Drusius ‘de tribus Sectis Judæorum.’ 8vo. Franekeræ, 1605. 4to. Arnheimii, 1619.

This custom of the Jews continued after Christ's time, and after their expulsion from the Holy Land; and continues (as I shewed from Leo Modena) to this day, if there be any that nowadays do turn proselytes to their religion. Wherever they sojourned, if they found any of that country that chose to be of their religion, they would not admit him, unless he would first be washed or baptized by them. And some heathen writers do express a great deal of scorn and disdain at this their valuing themselves upon their own purity in comparison with other nations. So Arrianus, a philosopher at Rome, (about the year of Christ 147,) jeers<sup>k</sup> those that turned proselytes to the Jews, calling them *βεβαμμένους*, dipped: and describes their custom to be, that when a man is so dipped by them, then he is accounted *τῷ ὄντι Ἰουδαῖος*, a right Jew: and calls one that is a counterfeit proselyte to them, *παραβαπτιστὴν*, one that puts an abuse upon their ceremony of baptism.

This solemn baptizing of proselytes differed from the rest of their divers baptisms (which St. Paul, Heb. x. 10, says were customary among the Jews) in this: that those others were upon new occasions of uncleanness, &c. many times repeated; but this was never given but once to one person. It was called (as Dr. Lightfoot shews<sup>l</sup>) 'baptism for proselytism,' distinct from 'baptism for uncleanness.'

II. It is not very material to our purpose to inquire upon what reasons or authorities this custom of the Jews, of baptizing all proselytes, was grounded. All that is material, is to know that they had time out of mind such a custom. And for that, the sayings of their own writers here produced are a sufficient evidence. Yet I shall spend a few words in shewing how they prove the necessity of this washing, or baptizing, from Moses' law.

They take notice that Moses, Numb. xv. 15, orders thus, *One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger (or proselyte) that sojourneth with you. An ordinance for ever in your generations: As ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord. One law and one manner shall be for you and for the stranger, &c.* Now they reckon that the Israelites themselves were, at their entering into covenant with God at the time of their receiving the law in mount Sinai, all of them washed or baptized. So they understand those words, Exod. xix. 10, *And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to day and to morrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day: for the third day the Lord will come down, &c.* They understand the meaning of that command by which Moses was to sanctify the people on

<sup>k</sup> Dissert. in Epictet. lib. ii. c. 9.

<sup>l</sup> Hor. Hebr. on Matth. iii. 6.

those two days, to be the washing of them: and so that word, *to sanctify*, does commonly signify in the Jewish law, (as several writers have shewn by many instances, and I also do in this book<sup>m</sup> give some,) especially when it is spoken of a man sanctifying other men. And Maimonides, Mickvaoth. item More Nebochim, part iii. c. 33, says; This is a rule; that ‘wheresoever in the law the washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means still the washing of the whole body.’ And the same is affirmed, Gemara Babyl. Tit. Jabimoth, c. iv. fol. 46. And so Aben Ezra, on that place of scripture<sup>n</sup> where Jacob, being to meet with God at Beth-el, said to his household; *Be clean, and change your garments*; understands the washing of their bodies. And Selden<sup>o</sup> shews by the expositions which the Jewish commentators give on Levit. xi. 25, 28, 40: xiv. 8, 47: Numb. xix. 10, 21: xxxi. 24. and several other texts where washing of garments is mentioned, that they always understand washing of the whole body. And for the like understanding of the foresaid place in Exod. xix. 10. quotes Mechilta, Nachmanid, R. Bechai, Moses Mikotsi, &c.

That they gave this (baptism of the Jews, and the command for proselytes to be as the Jews were) as a proof that proselytes must be baptized, appears by the words of Maimonides in the place before quoted. For he first says thus: ‘By three things did Israel enter into covenant, by circumcision, and baptism, and sacrifice. Circumcision was in Egypt, as it is written, *No uncircumcised person shall eat thereof*, &c. Baptism was in the wilderness just before the giving of the Law: as it is written<sup>q</sup>, *Sanctify them to day and to morrow, and let them wash their clothes*. And sacrifice; as it is said<sup>r</sup>, *And he sent young men of the children of Israel which offered burnt offerings*,’ &c.

And then he adds that which I recited before, concerning proselytes; ‘and so in all ages when an ethnic is willing, &c., he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a sacrifice; as it is written, *As you are, so shall the stranger be*,’ &c.

And so says the *Talmud*, *Tract. Repud.*

‘Israel does not enter into covenant but by these three things, by circumcision, baptism, and peace offering; and the proselytes, in like manner.’

And again, *ad Tit. Cherithoth*, cap. ii.

‘*As you are, so shall the stranger be*. As you are, that is, as was done to your fathers. And what was done to them? Your fathers

<sup>m</sup> Part i. chap. II. § 11.  
<sup>p</sup> Exod. xii. 48.

<sup>n</sup> Gen. xxxv. 2.  
<sup>q</sup> Exod. xix. 10.

<sup>o</sup> De Synedr. lib. i. c. 3.  
<sup>r</sup> Exod. xxiv. 5.

‘ did not enter into covenant but by circumcision, and baptism, and  
 ‘ sprinkling of blood. So neither do proselytes enter into covenant  
 ‘ but by circumcision, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood.’

And *Rabbi Solomon, in loc.*

‘ Our rabbis teach that our fathers entered into covenant by cir-  
 ‘ cumcision, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood,’ &c.

The ancient Christians, especially such of them as lived in places where they could have converse with the learned Jews, and might learn from them the meaning of the Hebrew phrases used in the Old Testament, do also speak of this baptism of the Jews.

So Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 39, shewing the preference of the Christian baptism before the Jewish, says, ‘Εβάρτισε Μωσῆς, ἀλλ’ ἐν ὕδατι καὶ πρὸ τούτου ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν θαλάσσῃ. τυπικῶς δὲ τοῦτο ἦν, ὡς καὶ Παῦλος δοκεῖ, &c. ‘ Moses gave a baptism, but that was  
 ‘ with water only. And before that they were baptized in the  
 ‘ cloud and in the sea. But these were but a type (or figure) of  
 ‘ ours; as Paul also understands it.’

And *St. Cyprian, Epist. 73. ad Jubaianum.*

‘ Alia enim fuit Judæorum sub apostolis ratio, alia est Gentilium  
 ‘ conditio. Illi, quia jam legis et Moysi antiquissimum baptismum  
 ‘ fuerant adepti, in nomine quoque Jesu Christi erant baptizandi.’

‘ The case of the Jews who were to be baptized by the apostles  
 ‘ was different from the case of the Gentiles; for the Jews had  
 ‘ already, and a long time ago, the baptism of the Law and of  
 ‘ Moses; and were now to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.’

Also St. Basil, in his oration of Baptism, compares together the baptisms of Moses, of John, and of Christ. Whose words I shall quote, part i. chap. 12. sect. 7. of this collection.

And before them all, Tertullian, having in his Book of Baptism, chap. v. sect. 5. shewn by several particulars, that the heathens had used of old a certain rite of baptizing, which they said was for their regeneration, and for the forgiveness of their sins, applies to it this observation; *Hic quoque studium Diaboli cognoscimus res Dei emulantis, cum et ipse baptismum in suis exerceat.* ‘ Here we see the aim  
 ‘ of the Devil to ape (or imitate) the things of God; since he also  
 ‘ sets up a baptism for his disciples.’

Now the divine baptism, which, he says, the Devil imitated, must be the Jewish baptism. For the rites of Apollo and Ceres (in which he there instances, as those in which the said baptism was used) were long before the times of the Christian baptism. The place I recite among some other passages of Tertullian, part i. chap. 4. sect. II.



And Mr. Selden, de Synedr. lib. i. cap. 3, observes that that saying of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, *All our Fathers were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea*, would have been difficult for those to whom St. Paul wrote, to make any sense of; had it not been a thing well known at that time when the apostle wrote, that the Jews looked upon themselves as having been entered into covenant by baptism: and that St. Paul spoke as alluding to that. And Dr. Hammond concludes the same<sup>s</sup>.

III. Secondly, it is to be observed, that if any such proselyte, who came over to the Jewish religion and was baptized into it, had any infant children then born to him; they also were at the father's desire circumcised and baptized, and admitted as proselytes. The child's inability to declare or promise for himself was not looked on as a bar against his reception into the covenant: but the desire of his father to dedicate him to the true God, was counted available, and sufficient to justify his admission. So that it was with such a proselyte as it was with Abraham at his first admission to the covenant of circumcision: as Abraham of ninety-nine years old, and Ishmael his son of thirteen years old, and all the males in his house that were eight days old or upward, were circumcised at the same time; so such a proselyte with all his, were both baptized (and circumcised if they were male children) and had each of them a sacrifice (such as was by law<sup>t</sup> required for a Jew's child) made for them; but if females, they were baptized, and a sacrifice was offered for them.

And the reason which the Jewish writers give, why it was not necessary to stay to see whether the child, when come to age, would be willing to engage himself in the covenant of the true God, or not, is this; that it is out of the reach of any doubt or controversy, that this is for his good. Where there may be any question made whether a thing be beneficial, or not; the concerns of a child are not to be disposed of by another: but here the benefit of being dedicated to Jehovah, (of which dedication these rites were the sacrament and seal) is evident and unquestionable. One may (as they give the reason) 'privilege a person, though he be incapable of knowing it; but one ought not to disprivilege a person without his knowledge.'

They judge therefore that a proselyte had no more need to expect his child's consent to be cleansed by this baptism or washing from the unclean and accursed estate in which he was born, than a natural Jew had to make any such delay in giving his child circum-

<sup>s</sup> Six Queries, Inf. Bapt. sect. 7, 8. [in vol. i. of his works.]

<sup>t</sup> Luke ii. 24.

cision, the seal of the covenant. Which delay, instead of being cautious, would have been impious. This reason of theirs will appear in their sayings, which I am now going to produce.

*Gemara Babylon. Chethuboth, cap. i. fol. 11.*

‘ If with a proselyte his sons and his daughters be made proselytes ; that which is done by their father redounds to their good.’

And it is not only the Gemara, (which perhaps some will object against as not being ancient enough,) but the text of the Misna itself (which is a system of the traditions and received customs of the Jews, compiled within one hundred years of the time of John’s and Christ’s baptizing, as learned men<sup>u</sup> have computed the distance) mentions the same usage. For the Misna Chethuboth, both in the Babylonian and in the Jerusalem Talmud, speaks of a child becoming, or being made, a proselyte. The Jerusalem Misna says, ‘ that if a girl, born of heathen parents, be made a proselyte after she be three years and a day old, then she is not to have such and such privileges there mentioned.’ And that of the Babylon edition says, ‘ that if she be made a proselyte before that age, she shall have the said privileges.’ Both agreeing (as Selden reciting<sup>x</sup> those places observes) that a child of never so little age might by ‘ their custom be made a proselyte.’ Which is also shewn by Dr. Wotton to be a just consequence from the words of that law, which he cites more largely, and in the original. Misc. Disc. vol. i. c. 8. And then the Gemara there gives the reason, or rather takes off the objection which might be made because of their nonage ; saying,

‘ They are wont to baptize such a proselyte in infancy upon the profession of the House of judgment (the court). For this is for his good.’

And the gloss there (having first put in an exception, that if the father of the child be alive and present, the child is baptized at his request ; but if not, on the profession of the court) comments thus on those words :

They are wont to baptize. ‘ Because,’ says the gloss, ‘ none is made a proselyte without circumcision and baptism.’ Upon the profession of the House of judgment. ‘ That is, the three men have the care of his baptism, according to the law of the baptism of proselytes, which requires three men, who do so become to him a father. And he is by them made a proselyte,’ &c.

So that, as Selden there expresses it, ‘ A proselyte, if of age, made profession to the court that he would keep Moses’ law. But

<sup>u</sup> Dr. Prideaux, Connexion, book v. and Dr. Wotton, Preface to Miscellaneous

Discourses, 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1718.

<sup>x</sup> De Synedriis, lib. i. cap. 3.

‘ in the case of minors the court itself did profess in their name the same thing. Just as in the Christian church the godfathers do ; at least if their parents were not there to do it for them.’

And Maimonides, in the chapter I quoted before, Issuri Bia, c. 13. §. 7. after he has discoursed what I there recited of the baptism of grown persons made proselytes, adds the same that the Gemara had said.

‘ A proselyte that is under age they are wont to baptize upon the knowledge (or profession) of the House of judgment (or court) ; because this is for his good.’

If a child were fatherless, and his mother brought him, they baptized him at her desire ; but the court professed for him, as the Gemara says at the place forecited.

Concerning the age of the child to be baptized, they had this rule : ‘ Any male child of such a proselyte, that was under the age of thirteen years and a day, and females that were under twelve years and a day, they baptized as infants at the request and by the assent of the father, or the authority of the court ; because such an one was not yet the son of assent, as they phrase it, i. e. not capable to give assent for himself, but the thing is for his good. If they were above that age they consented for themselves.’ This Selden shews, both in his book *de Jure Nat. et Gent. juxta Hebræos*, lib. ii. cap. 2, and also *de Synedr.* lib. i. cap. 3, by particulars too large to be inserted here.

Rabbi Joseph indeed gives this sentence, that when they grow to years they may retract. Where the gloss writes thus : ‘ this is to be understood of little children who are made proselytes together with their fathers.’ And the same is the opinion of some people concerning Christians’ children baptized in infancy. But the council of Trent anathematizes<sup>y</sup> this opinion.

What has been said of the baptism of children of proselytes is to be understood of such children as were born before the parents themselves were baptized ; for all the children that were born to them afterward, they reckoned were clean by their birth ; as being born of parents that were cleansed from the polluted state of heathenism, and that were in the covenant of Abraham, and were become as natural Jews. They therefore did by them only the same thing that the natural Jews did by their children ; that is, for the male children they used circumcision, and sacrifice, or offering ; and for the females only a sacrifice.

Dr. Hammond did indeed once maintain the contrary in a dis-



pute<sup>z</sup> with Mr. Selden and Mr. Tombes<sup>a</sup>, and thought that both the children of natural Jews were wont to be baptized, and also the children of proselytes born after their parents' baptism. But the learned men that have since made a more exact inquiry in the books of the learned Jews, have found and given their verdict, that Selden was in the right, and the doctor in a mistake in that matter. And Bishop Taylor, Mr. Walker<sup>b</sup>, &c., have followed him in that mistake.

The natural Jews reckoned that neither they themselves nor their children did stand in any need of this baptism, never since the time (which I mentioned before) when their whole nation, men, women, and infants, were baptized before the giving of the law on mount Sinai. It was our Saviour who first ordered by himself and by his forerunner, that every particular person, Jew or Gentile, or of what parents soever born, must be *born<sup>c</sup> again of water*. As for the proselytes' baptism, it was a rule among them, as Mr. Selden shews<sup>d</sup>, that 'it was never reiterated on him or his posterity.' And as other learned men do shew, that *filius baptizati habetur pro baptizato*; 'he that is born of a baptized parent is accounted as baptized.' And Dr. Lightfoot<sup>e</sup> gives this as their rule, 'The sons of proselytes, 'in following generations, were circumcised indeed, but not baptized—as being already Israelites.'

And though the child were begotten and conceived in the womb before the parents were baptized; yet if they (and particularly if the mother) were baptized before it was born into the world, the Jews had a saying (which is quoted by Dr. Hammond<sup>f</sup> himself) recorded by Maimonides, Iss. Bia. cap. 13. and also in the Talmud.

'A heathen woman, if she is made a proselytess when big with child, that child needs not baptism; for the baptism of the mother 'serves him for baptism.'

IV. Thirdly, this is also plainly proved and agreed by all the learned men aforesaid, and by all others, to have been the custom of the Jews; that if they found any child that had been exposed in the fields, woods, or highways by the heathens, or if they took in war any infant children, whom they brought home as booty, and

<sup>z</sup> Defence of Infant Baptism, 4to. 1655: reprinted in the second volume of his works, in folio.

<sup>a</sup> [John Tombes, a learned baptist minister, published several pieces on the subject of infant-baptism, chiefly against S. Marshal, R. Baxter, H. Savage, J. Cragg, and H. Vaughan, between the years 1646 and 1659. Dr. Hammond replied to part of his 'Anti-pædobaptism.' See the opinion which Dr. Wall entertained of his

abilities, in part ii. ch. 2, of this work.]

<sup>b</sup> [See A Modest Plea for Infants' Baptism, wherein the Lawfulness of the baptizing of Infants is defended against the Anti-pædobaptists, &c., by W. W[alker], B. D. 12mo., Cambridge, 1677.]

<sup>c</sup> John iii. 3, 5.

<sup>d</sup> De Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. ii. cap. 2.

<sup>e</sup> [Horæ Hebraicæ on St. Matthew, iii. 6: in his Works, vol. ii. p. 120.]

<sup>f</sup> Six Queries, Inf. Bapt. §. 109.



intended to bring them up in their religion, they baptized them in infancy, and accounted them as proselytes. So says

*Maimonides, Halach Aibdim, c. 8.*

‘An Israelite that takes a little heathen child, or that finds an ‘heathen infant, and baptizes him for a proselyte: behold he is a ‘proselyte.’

At this baptism of such a child the owner of him was wont to determine whether he should be a slave or a freeman: and he was baptized in the name of the one or of the other accordingly. To which purpose is that rule of rabbi Hezekiah, set down in the

*Hierosol. Jevamoth, fol. 8. 4.*

‘Behold, one finds an infant cast out, and baptizes him in the ‘name of a servant. Do thou also circumcise him in the name of a ‘servant. But if he baptize him in the name of a freeman: do ‘thou also circumcise him in the name of a freeman.’

These cases were very frequent. For besides that many proselytes of the Gentiles came over with their children; the Jews’ custom in war was to bring away the children of the people whom they conquered, that they might either make servants of them, or, if they took a liking to them, adopt them for their own. And it was a common thing with the heathens to expose their infants, whom they would not be at the charge to bring up, in the high-ways, &c. So that Dr. Lightfoot says<sup>g</sup>, ‘The baptizing of infants ‘was a thing as well known in the church of the Jews, as ever it ‘has been in the Christian church.’

V. Now this gives great light for the better understanding the meaning of our Saviour, when he bids his apostles<sup>h</sup> ‘Go and disciple ‘all the nations, and baptize them.’ For when a commission is given in such short words, and there is no express direction what they shall do with the infants of those who become proselytes; the natural and obvious interpretation is, that they must do in that matter as they and the church in which they lived always used to do.

As now at this time, if an island or country of heathens be discovered, and a minister be sent out to them by the bishops of the church of England, who should say, ‘Go and convert such a nation, ‘and baptize them;’ he would know without asking any question, that he must baptize the infants of those, who, being converted, offered them to baptism; because he knows that to be the meaning and the custom of that church or bishop, by which he is sent. And on the contrary, if any one were sent from a church or congregation

<sup>g</sup> Hor. Hebr. on Matt. iii. 6.

<sup>h</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19.

of antipædobaptists with a commission of the same words, ‘Go and ‘convert such a nation, and baptize them;’ he would take it for granted that he must baptize none of their infants, because he knows that to be contrary to the meaning and custom of the church that sends him.

So when the apostles were sent out to the heathen nations with a commission of no other words than these, *Go and disciple* (or proselyte) *all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*: when the case came in hand, of the infant children of those that were discipled, what could they think other but that they must do with them as had been usually done in that church in which they and their Master had always lived? Since the nations were to be proselyted, how could they, without particular order, alter any thing in the customary way of receiving proselytes of the nations? For to disciple the nations to Christ, is the same thing as to proselyte them to him: and probably in the Hebrew text of St. Matthew, was the same word: and we see that the customary phrase and language of the Jews was to call the infants *young proselytes*, or *disciples*; as I shall shew that Justin Martyr, one of the eldest Christian writers, calls the Christian infants likewise.

If our Saviour meant that the apostles should make any alteration in that matter, and not baptize the infants, as had been usually done; it is a wonder He did not say so.

The antipædobaptists depend upon this as an unerring rule; that since our Saviour did not say (or at least St. Matthew does not recite that he said) baptize the infants also; his meaning must have been that they should not baptize them.

But if they would put this case; suppose our Saviour had bid the apostles, *Go and disciple all the nations*, and (instead of baptizing had said) circumcise them: an antipædobaptist will grant that in that case, without any more words, the apostles must have circumcised the infants of the nations as well as the grown men, though there had been no express mention of infants in the commission: so that that is not always an unerring rule.

And what is the reason that in case circumcision had been appointed for the nations, it must have been of course given to infants, though they had not been expressly named? The reason is this: because the apostles knew of themselves, that circumcision was usually given to infants. If it do appear then, that baptism was

also usually given to infants, and the apostles must know it, the same reason would direct them to the same interpretation.

If it had been circumcision that had been ordered, the apostles going out into the nations must have circumcised the grown men at the age that they found them of: but they would have circumcised the infants also; because one that is to be circumcised at all should be circumcised in infancy, if one has then the power or direction of him. So they must baptize the grown men among the nations at the age that they found them of: and we have reason to conclude that they must think themselves obliged to give baptism (or order it to be given) to the infants also; because by the rules of baptism received in their nation, all that were to be baptized at all, were baptized in infancy, if they had then the power and direction of them.

And though the proof that circumcision was usually given to infants, is taken from the writings of the Old Testament; but the proof that baptism was usually given to the infants of proselytes is taken only from the testimonies of the Jews themselves: yet the Jews themselves (how fallible soever they are in judging of the meaning of the law, what ought to be done, or how necessary it was, yet) cannot fail of being sufficient witnesses of the matter of fact, and able to tell what was actually done among themselves.

The difference which the Jews made between themselves and other nations in giving baptism to Gentile proselytes and their children, but not to themselves nor their own children, does not at all affect the question that is disputed between the Christian pædobaptists and antipædobaptists: because in respect of the Christian religion the Jews themselves have the same need of becoming proselytes and of being baptized, that other nations have. The gospel has concluded all under sin: and St. Paul, speaking of this very matter of baptism<sup>k</sup>, says, that in respect of it *there is neither Jew nor Greek*, i. e. there is no difference between them. The Jews themselves do seem to have understood, that when the Christ came, their nation must be baptized as well as others: and therefore they asked John, (who baptized Jews,) *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias?* &c., signifying that if he had been the Christ or Elias, they should not have wondered at his baptizing of Jews.

The same thing is to be said of that tenet of the Jews, that the infant children of a proselyte, born to him before his baptism, are to be baptized; but not the children born to him after his baptism,

<sup>k</sup> Gal. iii. 27, 28.

<sup>l</sup> John i. 25.



nor any of their posterity in any succeeding generations, they being now looked on as natural Jews.

This, I say, does not affect the question of Christian paedobaptism. Because that privilege which the Jew had, or supposed himself to have, above other people, is as to the Christian dispensation abolished: and because both the paedobaptists and antipaedobaptists are agreed that all persons do now need baptism; as well those that are born of baptized, as those that are born of unbaptized parents: our Saviour having satisfied Nicodemus<sup>m</sup> that *that which is born of the flesh* (whether of a Jewish or Gentile, baptized or unbaptized parent) *is flesh, and must be born again.*

The antipaedobaptists are satisfied of this; the only question is, at what age they must be baptized. Now the practice of the Jews before and in our Saviour's time was, that all persons whom they baptized at all they baptized in infancy, if they had, as I said, the power or possession of them in infancy. And in this matter our Saviour gave no direction for any alteration. 'He took' (as Dr. Lightfoot<sup>n</sup> says) 'into his hands baptism such as he found it; 'adding only this, that he exalted it to a nobler purpose and to a 'larger use.'

Some Socinians indeed would have the use of baptism to be abolished in all Christian nations, where the body of the people has once been generally baptized: and do say of Christian baptism, as the Jews did of theirs, that the baptism of the forefathers is sufficient for them and all their posterity. This reason against the continuance of baptism, which was never thought a reason by any Christians before, Socinus gave about 150 years ago; 'Water baptism seems unnecessary for those that are born of Christians, and 'do imitate their parents in the profession of Christianity. It 'matters not whether such be baptized or not. And if they be, it 'is all one whether it be at their adult age or in infancy.' Which opinion, or one more against baptism, the Quakers have since taken up. But the antipaedobaptists do hold it necessary, as I said, for every particular person, and not only for a nation at the first planting of Christianity.

And it is easy to guess what it was that swayed Socinus into the other opinion; viz. his desire of abolishing the doctrine of the Trinity: which it was hard to accomplish so long as persons were continually baptized into that faith.

There never was any age (at least since Abraham) in which the

<sup>m</sup> John iii. 6, 7.

<sup>n</sup> Hor. Hebr. in Matt. iii. 6.

<sup>o</sup> Epist. de Baptismo, apud Vossium de Baptismo, Disp. 13.



children, whether of Jews or proselytes, that were admitted into covenant, had not some badge or sign of such their admission. The male children of Abraham's race were entered by circumcision. The whole body of the Jews, men, women, and children, were in Moses' time baptized. After which the male children of proselytes that were entered with their parents, were (as well as their parents) admitted by circumcision, baptism, and a sacrifice: the female children by baptism and a sacrifice. The male children of the natural Jews, and such male children of proselytes as were born after their parents' baptism, by circumcision and a sacrifice: and the female children by a sacrifice offered for them by the head of the family. Now after that circumcision and sacrifice were to be abolished, there was nothing left but baptism, or washing, for a sign of the covenant and of professing religion. This our Saviour took (probably as being the easiest and the least operose of all the rest; and as being common to both sexes, making no difference of male or female) and enjoined it to all that should *enter into the kingdom of God* P. And St. Paul does plainly intimate to the Colossians, ch. ii. 11, 12, that it served them instead of circumcision: calling it *the circumcision of Christ*, or *Christian circumcision*.

The baptism indeed of the nations by the apostles ought to be regulated by the practice of John and of Christ himself, (who by the hands of his disciples baptized many Jews,) rather than by any preceding custom of the Jewish nation; if we had any good ground to believe that they did in the case of infants differ, or alter any thing from the usual way. But we have no kind of proof that they made any such alteration. The commission which our Saviour gave to his disciples to baptize in the country of Judæa, during his abode with them, is not at all set down, as I said. And what John did in this particular, we have no means left to know, but by observing what was done before and after.

There is no express mention indeed of any children baptized by him; but to those that consider the commonness of the thing (which I have here shewn) for people that came to be baptized to bring their children along with them, that is no more a cause to think that he baptized no children, than one's minding that in the history of the Old Testament there is sometimes 500 years together without the mention of any child circumcised, is a cause to think that none were circumcised all that while. And whereas it is said of the multitudes that came to John, that they *were baptized by him confessing their sins*, (which confession can be understood only of the

P John iii. 5.

grown persons,) that is no more than would be said in the case of a minister of the church of England (which I put before) going and converting a heathen nation. For in a short account which should be sent of his success, it would be said that multitudes came and were baptized, *confessing their sins*: and there would need no mention of their bringing their children with them; because the converting of the grown persons was the principal and most difficult thing, and it would be supposed that they brought their children of course.

I shall, at ch. 13. of this my collection, shew it to be probable that St. Ambrose does take it for granted that John must have baptized infants as well as others: for he does by way of allusion make a comparison between Elias and him; and speaks of Elias' turning the waters of Jordan back toward the spring-head, as a type of the baptism of infants, by which they were reformed from their natural corrupt state back again to the primitive innocence of nature. And St. Ambrose does not there stand to prove that any infants were baptized: but speaks of it as of a thing commonly so understood by all Christians. And so Dr. Lightfoot says on this account<sup>1</sup>, 'I do not believe the people that flocked to John's baptism were so forgetful of the manner and custom of the nation, as not to bring their little children along with them to be baptized.'

And the same man, who was most excellently skilled in the books and customs of the Jews, says at another place<sup>2</sup>; 'If baptism and baptizing infants had been a new thing, and unheard of till John Baptist came, as circumcision was till God appointed it to Abraham; there would have been, no doubt, as express command for baptizing infants, as there was for circumcising them. But when the baptizing of infants was a thing commonly known and used, as appears by incontestable evidence from their writers; there need not be express assertions that such and such persons were to be the object of baptism: when it was as well known before the gospel began, that men, women, and children were baptized, as it is to be known that the sun is up, when' &c.

And he deduces the argument with great evidence in this fashion<sup>3</sup>:

'The whole nation knew well enough that infants were wont to be baptized. There was no need of a precept for that which was always settled by common use. Suppose there should at this time come out a proclamation in these words: Every one on the Lord's day shall repair to the public assembly in the church. That man would dote, who should in times to come conclude that there were no prayers, sermons, psalms, &c. in the public assemblies on the

<sup>1</sup> Hor. Hebr. on Matt. iii.    <sup>2</sup> Harmony on John i. 25.    <sup>3</sup> Hor. Hebr. on Matt. iii.

‘ Lord’s day, for this reason, because there was no mention of them in this proclamation. For the proclamation ordered the keeping of the Lord’s day in the public assemblies in general : and there was no need that mention should be made of the particular kinds of divine worship there to be used ; since they were both before and at the time of the said proclamation known to every body, and in common use.

‘ Just so the case stood as to baptism. Christ ordered it to be for a sacrament of the New Testament, by which all should be admitted to the profession of the gospel, as they were formerly to proselytism in the Jews’ religion. The particular circumstances of it, as the manner of baptizing, the age of receiving it, which sex was capable of it, &c., had no need of being regulated or set down, because they were known to every body by common usage.

‘ It was therefore necessary on the other side, that there should have been an express and plain order that infants and little children should not be baptized, if our Saviour had meant that they should not. For since it was ordinary in all ages before to have infants baptized ; if Christ would have had that usage to be abolished, he would have expressly forbidden it. So that his and the scriptures’ silence in this matter does confirm and establish infant-baptism for ever.’

VI. Fourthly, another thing observable about the Jewish baptism of proselytes, is this ; that they called such an one’s baptism his *new-birth*, *regeneration*, or *being born again*.

This was a very usual phrase of the Jews.

*Gemara, tit. Jevamoth, cap. 4. fol. 62. 1.*

‘ If any one become a proselyte, he is like a child new born.’

*Maimonides, Iss. Bia, cap. 14. s. 11.*

‘ The Gentile that is made a proselyte, and the slave that is made free ; behold, he is like a child new born.’

The rabbies do much enlarge on this privilege of a proselyte’s being put into a new state, and putting off all his former relations : those that were akin to him before are now no longer so ; but he is just as if he were born of a new mother, as the Talmud often expresses it. And it was probably from the much talk that they made on this subject, that Tacitus the Roman historian (who lived in the apostles’ time) drew the notion he had of the Jews’ practice in initiating proselytes.

‘ The first thing,’ says he<sup>t</sup>, ‘ that they teach them is, to despise the gods, (which they worshipped before,) to renounce their

<sup>t</sup> Hist. lib. v. c. 5.

‘country : *parentes, liberos, fratres, vilia habere* ; to make no account of their parents, children, or kindred.’

And some do think that St. Paul alludes to this notion, when he says, 2 Cor. v. 16, 17, *Henceforth know we no man after the flesh, &c. If any one be in Christ, he is a new creature. Old things are passed away, &c.* And St. Peter, when he calls the Christians *new born babes*<sup>u</sup>.

The Talmudical doctors do indeed carry on this metaphor of the new birth too far in all reason : they determine that it is no incest for such an one to marry any of his nearest kindred, because upon his being new born all former relations do cease ; so that if he marry his own mother, he does not sin.

But letting pass the vain and absurd consequences which they drew from this figurative speech, it is abundantly evident that the common phrase of the Jews was to call the baptism of a proselyte, his regeneration or new birth.

And the Christians did in all ancient times continue the use of this name for baptism, so as that they never use the word *regenerate*, or *born again*, but that they mean or connote by it *baptism*. Of which I shall produce no proof here, because almost all the quotations which I shall bring in this book will be instances of it.

Now the knowledge of this makes those words of our Saviour to Nicodemus in the third chapter of St. John to be much more intelligible to us ; where he tells him, that, *except any one be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*. He used that which was then the ordinary phrase. All that was new in that saying of our Saviour was this ; the Jews knew that any Gentile that would enter the kingdom of God must be born again ; but our Saviour assures Nicodemus, that every one, Jew or Gentile, must be so born. And when Nicodemus did not apprehend his meaning, but took the words in a proper sense, our Saviour speaks plainer, and says, that *every one must be born of water, &c.*, wondering at the same time, that he, being a master in Israel, had not understood him.

This puts it beyond all doubt that our Saviour is to be understood there of baptism, (of which some people, since the disuse of the word *regenerated* or *born again* for *baptized* have made a doubt,) and also guides us into a ready conception of the sense of those sayings of the ancient Christian writers where they use the word ; and of St. Paul for one, when he mentions *the washing of regeneration*<sup>x</sup>.

There are some other more plain and gross mistakes made by

<sup>u</sup> 1 Ep. ch. ii. 2.

<sup>x</sup> Tit. iii. 5.



some men in the understanding of those words of our Saviour to Nicodemus: as, that of those who being able to read none but the English translation, where it is worded, *Except a man be born again*, &c., do conceive that they concern only grown men: and that of those who tell us, that by *the kingdom of God* in that text is meant, not the kingdom of glory, but something else. The absurdity of which mistakes will be occasionally shewn in the following collection of the sayings of the eldest Christians, who do very frequently quote this text.

VII. It may be useful to illustrate the point in hand, if we do here institute a parallel between the Jewish and the Christian baptism, and the modes and circumstances used in each; by which it will more plainly appear, that St. John, and our Saviour, and the apostles and primitive Christians, had an eye to the Jewish baptism in many of the rites and circumstances which they used at the administration of the Christian baptism: as all agree they had to the Jewish passover in the ordering of the other sacrament.

1. As there was a stipulation made by the whole people of the Jews just before their baptism, Exod. xix. 5, *If you will keep my covenant*, &c. the people answering, ver. 8, *All that the Lord has spoken we will do*, &c. And Moses returned the words of the people to the Lord, &c. And the Lord said, ver. 10, *Go and sanctify them, and let them wash their clothes*, (i. e. their whole bodies.)

And as the Jews did accordingly afterwards require, of any that were to be proselyted or entered as disciples to their religion, a stipulation to renounce idolatry, &c. Maimonid. Iss. Bia. cap. 13. §. 14, 15; and to believe in Jehovah:

So the Christians required a like sort of stipulation of all whom they baptized: and being taught that all idolatry is offering to devils, they expressed it, *Renouncing the Devil and all his works*, &c. And to believe in the Trinity. From whence it is probably, that St. Peter, 1 Ep. iii. 21, calls baptism *ἐπερώτημα*, the interrogation, or stipulation, of a good conscience.

2. As the Jews, though the person to be baptized had before made this profession, yet interrogated him again as he stood in the water; as appears by the words of Maimonides, quoted § 1:

So the Christians required of all adult persons that were to be baptized, that beside the profession made before in the congregation, they should answer to each interrogatory of it over again, when they were going into the water: as I shew, pt. ii. c. 9. § 13.

3. As the Jews baptized the infant children of such proselytes as desired that their children should be entered into covenant with the

true God; so I have, through all the first part of this work, given the history of what the Christians did in respect of the infant children of Christian proselytes. And I believe all impartial readers of it will conclude that they did the same.

4. As the Jews required, that for an infant proselyte either his father or else the consistory (or church) of the place, or at least three grave persons, should answer or undertake at his baptism: (and they required the like at circumcision, as Buxtorf in his Synag. Jud. has fully shewn, and is not by any denied:)

So the Christians (as I shall shew at pt. ii. c. 9. § 13.) did the same; putting the several interrogatories of the Creed, and of the renunciations, and requiring the child's answer by his parents or other sponsors.

5. As such a proselyte of the Jews, when baptized, was said to be born again: so our Saviour, and the apostles and primitive Christians, gave the same term to Christian baptism. As appears, John iii. 3, 5; Tit. iii. 5, and in almost all the passages of this my collection.

6. The Jews told such a proselyte, that he was now taken out of his unclean state, and put into a state of sanctity or holiness, Iss. Bia. cap. 14. § 14.

So the scriptures of the New Testament do call the baptized Christians the *saints*, the *holy*, the *sanctified* in Christ Jesus; and say, that the church of them is *sanctified with the washing of water*, &c. Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2. item, vii. 14; Eph. v. 26. And it will appear by many quotations which I shall produce from the ancient Christians, that there is nothing more common with them than to call baptism by the name of *sanctification*, and to say *sanctified* or *holy* instead of *baptized*, and to give to persons, while they continue unbaptized, the name of *unclean*.

7. The Jews declared the baptized proselyte to be now under the wings of the divine majesty, or Shechinah: Iss. Bia. c. 13. § 4.

This was more visibly made good to the new baptized Christians, by palpable signs and effects of the Holy Spirit coming on them. And as the laying on of the hands of an apostle was in the primitive church employed to procure this, (or of a bishop as the supreme pastor when the apostles were dead, for obtaining the more ordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit;) so there is good reason to believe that the Jews had before used this ceremony of laying on of hands on this occasion, for it was a thing used by them on almost all occasions that were solemn.

8. The paschal season is known to have been the most solemn

time, both with the Jews and Christians, for admitting proselytes or disciples by baptism. The Jews did then baptize all the proselytes that were ready, for this reason, that they might be admitted to partake of the passover and sacrifices. The Christians observed the same time for a like reason.

9. In the Jews' time, some Gentiles were absolute idolaters; some came nearer to the Jews' religion, believing their God to be the true God, and were called *proselytes of the gate*. And of these last, some who declared their desire to be circumcised and baptized, and submit to the whole law, were (for some time before their circumcision and baptism) distinguished from the rest.

So in the first preachings of Christianity in heathen places, some slighted it; some gave so much regard to it, as to hear at least what the Christians preached, and were called *audientes*. Some, beginning to approve it, submitted to a course of catechising, and were called *catechumens*. And of these, such as desired baptism, and were now fit for it, were called *competentes*.

Now both under the Jewish and Christian dispensation, these men, as they stood in the said different degrees of preparation to baptism, had different places and liberties of access, both among the Jews to their temple and synagogues, and among the Christians to their churches and public offices; as is largely shewn from Jewish and Christian antiquities by the author (whom I mentioned before) of the Discourse concerning Lent<sup>y</sup>.

And those degrees of preparatory admission did so resemble one another, that it is plain that the first Christians imitated the Jews in the steps that they made towards admitting a proselyte to baptism.

It is true, that sometimes a person was convinced, converted, and believed, and was baptized, all in a short time; as the eunuch, the jailor, &c. But this was extraordinary, and the ordinary course was as I have said.

10. There were some other customs constantly used by the most ancient Christians at and after the baptizing of any person; which (since they are not mentioned in any command of our Saviour or the apostles recorded in the New Testament) one might wonder from whence they had them. As namely,

1. When they baptized any one, whether infant or adult, they thought it not enough to put him once into the water; but as his body was in the water, they put his head also three times into the water, so that his whole body was three several times under water.

<sup>y</sup> See note at p. 3.

This was the ordinary way, (but with an exception of sick, weakly persons, &c.) as I shew pt. ii. c. 9. § 2. and 4.

2. And after he came out of the water, they gave him to taste a portion of milk and honey mixed together.

3. And also they then anointed him with a sort of precious ointment.

The first Christians were too plain men to invent these things of themselves. And yet they were universally used. The books of the second century do speak of them as customs used time out of mind, and of which they knew no beginning.

The heretics also of the same time used them, as I shew in pt. ii. c. 9. § 6. item 8. So that the beginning of them must have been from a principle universally received.

And this could not probably come, but from such like customs used by the Jews at their baptizing of a proselyte. The author, whom I last mentioned, shews the probability of this for the two last; viz. the anointing, and the milk and honey: one, a ceremony much used by the Jews (and probably the Jewish proselyte was anointed with the blood of his own sacrifice that he offered): the other, the emblem of the Holy Land, to the enjoyment whereof he was now entitled. And for the first of the three, viz. the trine immersion; another person very learned in Jewish customs assures me, that their way of washing any person, or any thing, that was by their law to have a *terillah*, or solemn washing, was to do it three times over: so that a vessel that was to be washed, was drawn three times through water. And Mr. Selden says<sup>z</sup>, ‘it must be ‘the same quantity of water as that wherein a proselyte was baptized.’ Whence it is probable that they gave the proselyte a trine immersion; and that the Christians by their example did the like.

VIII. I shall conclude this introductory discourse with observing what a weak attempt that is, which sir Norton Knatchbull<sup>a</sup> has made to disprove this custom of the Jews to baptize proselytes; and how unlike to the rest of his annotations on the New Testament, which are deservedly valued. That learned gentleman seems to have had some disgust against Dr. Hammond, and to have endeavoured to oppose him in several of his criticisms and observations. Such a prejudiced endeavour does often lead men from a

<sup>z</sup> De Synedr. lib. i. c. 3.

<sup>a</sup> [Annotations upon some difficult Texts in all the Books of the New Testament, by sir Norton Knatchbull, Kt. and Bart. This work was first published in Latin, in 1659, and twice reprinted in

that language: but the author left at his death an English version with his last remarks and corrections; which was published at Cambridge in 1693, and is the edition here referred to.]



true judgment of things into a vein of cavilling. The doctor (but not he alone, but with him all that ever had any skill in the Jewish learning) had spoke of this custom of giving baptism to proselytes : and he had produced, among other proofs of it, a quotation out of the Gemara, (which I purposely omitted before, because it must be set down here.) Sir Norton picks out<sup>b</sup> one clause of that quotation, which taken by itself might seem to make for his purpose ; which is, that rabbi Eliezer had said, of one that was circumcised, and not baptized, that he was a proselyte. Now see the quotation at large.

*Gemara, tit. Jevamoth, c. 4.*

‘ Of him that was circumcised, and not baptized, rabbi Eliezer said, that he was a proselyte. Because, said he, we find of our fathers (Abraham, Isaac, &c.) that they were circumcised, but not baptized.

‘ And of him that was baptized, and not circumcised, rabbi Joshua said, that he was a proselyte. Because said he, we find of our mothers, that they were baptized, and not circumcised.

‘ But the wise men pronounced, that till he were both baptized and circumcised, he was not a proselyte.’

The question here was not whether proselytes ought, or were wont, to be baptized : but whether one that had neglected it, or by some chance had missed of it, could be counted for a proselyte. And the like question was made of one that had missed of circumcision. And Eliezer’s maintaining that one might possibly without baptism go for a proselyte, is no more an argument that proselytes were not usually baptized, than Joshua’s maintaining that one might without circumcision go for a proselyte, is an argument that proselytes were not usually circumcised. So far is that from being a good conclusion which sir Norton there draws from Eliezer’s words, viz. that he did expressly deny this baptism. On the contrary, the tenor of the discourse shews that it had been taken for granted and agreed, that a proselyte ought of right to have both circumcision and baptism : only Joshua had a favourable opinion against the absolute necessity of the first, as Eliezer had of the latter (and both of them were also declared singular in such their opinions) ; so that upon the whole this quotation does prove that which sir Norton Knatchbull brought it to disprove.

I give an account in the twentieth chapter of this book, how one Vincentius Victor maintained a dispute against St. Austin, that a child dying unbaptized might yet possibly be partaker of all that measure of glory which is promised to Christians. From whence a

<sup>b</sup> Annot. on 1 Pet. iii. 21. p. 306—309.

certain late antipædobaptist raised an argument, that Vincentius held that children were not to be baptized. Whereas Vincentius's words do, as I there shew, sufficiently prove, that he knew that children ought of right to have baptism: only he puts the case of a child that had missed of it. This argument, drawn from Eliezer's words to prove that proselytes were not wont to be baptized, runs on the same foot, and is as weak as that. It is certainly one thing to say, a person though not baptized might be accounted a proselyte, or, a child dying unbaptized may be saved: and another very different thing to say, that either one or the other were not wont, or ought not to be baptized. So that it is hard to guess what Mr. Stennet thinks he has gained to his cause by quoting so largely this discourse of sir Norton Knatchbull in his late book<sup>e</sup>.

Some objections Mr. Stennet adds there of his own, to overthrow this argument taken from the Jewish baptism: as that, 'If the Jews practised baptism to initiate proselytes, it must have been an invention of their own; for no such initiation is commanded in the law of God.'

But, 1, he may see that they quoted texts in the law of God for what they did in this matter.

And, 2, putting the case that they mistook the sense of those texts; yet when they had upon that authority established a practice of baptizing proselytes and their children; and that practice had now continued for many ages: if our Saviour had meant that his apostles in baptizing proselytes of the nations should have altered that practice, we have all the reason in the world to think that he would have forewarned them of it. And since he did not, we have reason to think that the Jews were not mistaken in what they did.

Suppose our Saviour had ordered his apostles to require the nations to keep the feasts. If he had meant that they should not keep the feast of the dedication, (which had no divine institution, but yet being become customary was observed by all the Jews, and even by Christ himself,) as well as the passover and the rest, (which had been commanded in the law,) he would doubtless in that case have excepted that. And there is the same reason in the case before us.

But that which Mr. Stennet there says in a challenging manner to Mr. Russen<sup>d</sup>, (who had mentioned this practice of the Jews,)

<sup>c</sup> [Answer to Mr. David Russen's book, entitled *Fundamentals without a Foundation, or a true Picture of the Anabaptists*. 8vo. London, 1704. Dr. Stennet, a learned baptist divine, was born in 1663, and died in 1713. See an

account of his character and works, in Crosby's *History of the English Baptists*, vol. IV. p. 319, &c. and in Ivimey's *History of the English Baptists*, vol. III.]

<sup>d</sup> [See the preceding note.]

‘Where does he find that the Jews always did and do still baptize infants; and that, to initiate them into the mysteries of religion?’ is too securely spoken. He may see here as in a specimen, but much more largely in the books of Selden, Lightfoot, &c. to which I have here referred, that they bring full proofs of the ancient practice of the Jews in this matter. And that the Jews do still continue so to do, there is no other question; than as it is a question, whether any proselytes do nowadays either come over themselves, or bring their children to be at all initiated in their religion: for the books that order the initiating of infants by baptism, are such as the present Jews do own for orthodox and authentic. Sir Norton Knatchbull has one argument which I wonder much at him for using, and at the other for borrowing it of him: because it had been very commonly answered long before he used it: which is; that if baptizing of proselytes had been in ordinary and familiar use with the Jews, the Pharisees would not have said to John; *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias?* &c.

If John had been then baptizing Gentile proselytes, and had not baptized the natural Jews; the Pharisees would not at all have wondered to see converted Gentiles baptized. Though the office of doing even that was probably not accounted lawful for any but such as had a commission from the Sanhedrim; which John, we suppose, had not: and therefore they might even in that case have examined by what authority he did it.

But the case here was quite otherwise. The multitudes whom John baptized, were mostly, if not all, natural Jews. And the Pharisees and other Jews (knowing that their own nation was not to have any other baptism than what they had already, till the Christ should come, or Elias his forerunner) looked upon this practice to be in effect the setting himself up for the Christ, or at least for Elias, (as he was indeed that *‘Elias (or forerunner) which was for to come,’*) and therefore it was that they sent *priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him; Who art thou?* And that all men mused in their hearts concerning him, whether he were the Christ or not. Luke iii. 15.

Ainsworth, Lightfoot, Hammond, and every one that has occasion, do shew the easiness of solving this doubt. The first of these, having largely shewn how common and known a custom this baptism of proselytes was, adds at the end of it<sup>h</sup>, ‘Hereupon baptism was nothing strange to the Jews when John the Baptist began

<sup>c</sup> John i. 25.<sup>f</sup> Matt. xi. 14.<sup>s</sup> John i.<sup>h</sup> Gen. xvii.

‘ his ministry, Matt. iii. 5, 6. They made question of his person ‘ that did it; but not of the thing itself, John i. 25.’

And it is plain that their questions put to John do naturally import no other. They do not ask him, *What meanest thou?* or, *What wouldst thou signify to us by this new ceremony of baptizing?* nor any question like that: but *Who art thou?* And when he confessed, John i. 20, *I am not the Christ*, they say, *What then? Art thou Elias?* &c. and when he said, *I am not*, (meaning that he was not Elias in that proper sense that they dreamt of; for they expected that very same person that had been carried to heaven,) they asked further, *Who art thou? What sayest thou of thyself? Why baptizest thou then*, (meaning the nation of the Jews,) *if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias*, &c.

All this has nothing in it to evince the contrary but that the Jews themselves did use before to baptize such heathens as came over to them. And indeed such a pompous recital of arguments that have been long ago commonly answered, may serve to amuse such as have not read the answers: but it is not fair nor ingenuous dealing for any learned men to use them for that purpose. It brings on the world that great inconvenience of being forced in books to say *pro* and *contra* the same things over and over again.



# THE HISTORY OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

---

## PART I.

---

### CHAPTER I.

*Quotations out of Clemens Romanus and Hermas.*

---

*Clemens Romanus, Epist. 1 ad Corinthios, xvii.*

§ 1. "ΕΤΙ δὲ καὶ περὶ Ἰὼβ οὕτω γέγραπται, Ἰὼβ ἦν δίκαιος καὶ ἄμεμπος, ἀληθινὸς, θεοσεβὴς, ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ. Ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορῶν λέγει· Οὐδεὶς καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ρύπου, οὐδὲ εἰ μίᾱς ἡμέρας ἢ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ.

‘Again of Job it is thus written, That he was just and blameless, true, one that feared God, and eschewed evil. Yet he condemns himself, and says, There is none free from pollution; no, not though his life be but of the length of one day.’

These words of Job are quoted from chap. xiv. 4, where the English translation is, *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.* But in the Greek translation made by the Septuagint, which was in use in the times of our Saviour and the apostles, they are as Clement here renders them; and they are accordingly so read by all the primitive Christians. And you will see in the following quotations that they often from thence conclude the necessity of baptism for the forgiveness of sins, even of a child that is but a day old. And in the next chapter he brings in, to the same purpose, the saying of David, Psalm li. 5.

Ibid. cap. 38.

Ἀναλογισώμεθα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐκ ποίας ὕλης ἐγεννήθημεν, ποιοὶ καὶ τίνες εἰσῆλθομεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ τάφου καὶ σκοτούς. Ὁ ποιήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δημιουργήσας εἰσῆγαγεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον αὐτοῦ, προετοιμάσας τὰς εὐεργεσίας αὐτοῦ πρὶν ἡμᾶς γεννηθῆναι.

‘Let us consider, therefore, brethren, whereof we were made; who and what kind of persons we came into this world, as if it

‘ were out of a sepulchre, and from utter darkness. He that made  
 ‘ and formed us, brought us into his own world, having prepared  
 ‘ for us his benefits before we were born.’

That which I produce these places for is, to shew what the doctrine of this apostolical man was, concerning the pollution and guilt with which infants are born into this world.

*Hermas Pastor*, lib. i. Visione 3. c. 3.

II. He having there described an emblem or vision, shewed him by a woman who represented the church, concerning a certain tower built on the water, by which the building of Christ’s church was signified, has these words :

‘ Interrogavi illam, Quare turris ædificata est super aquas, Domina? Dixeram tibi et prius versutum te esse, circa structuræ diligenter inquirentem: igitur invenies veritatem. Quare ergo super aquas ædificatur turris, audi. Quoniam vita vestra per aquam salva facta est, et fiet.’

‘ I asked her, Why is the tower built on the water? She answered, I said before that you were wise to inquire diligently concerning the building; therefore you shall know the truth. Hear, therefore, why the tower is built on the waters; Because your life is saved, and shall be saved by water.’

By this is denoted, that baptism with water is appointed the sacrament of salvation to such as are saved; which meaning will more plainly appear by the import of the passage following.

*Hermas Pastor*, lib. iii. Similitud. 9. c. 15 et 16.

He is there relating a vision of the same import as the other; the building of the church represented by the building of a tower, wherein all things are shewed and explained to him by an angel. He sees some stones put into this building that were drawn up from the deep; and others that were taken from the surface of the earth; the first denoting persons already dead; the other, persons yet alive.

Of those drawn up from the deep, he saw first ten stones, which filled one range of building next the foundation, then twenty-five more, then thirty-five more, then forty more. And afterward in the explication of the vision, he asks the angel :

‘ Lapides vero illi, domine, qui de profundo in structura aptati sunt, qui sunt? Decem, inquit, qui in fundamentis collocati sunt, primum seculum est: sequentes viginti quinque secundum seculum est justorum virorum. Illi autem triginta quinque<sup>a</sup> prophetæ Domini

<sup>a</sup> [Cotelerius omits the word *quinque* in this clause, but it seems to be merely a typographical error; compare c. 4.]

‘ ac ministri sunt. Quadraginta vero, apostoli et doctores sunt  
 ‘ prædicationis Filii Dei. Quare, inquam, de profundo hi lapides  
 ‘ ascenderunt, et positi sunt in structuram turris hujus, cum jam  
 ‘ pridem portaverint spiritus justos? Necesse est, inquit, ut per  
 ‘ aquam habeant ascendere, ut requiescant: non poterant enim  
 ‘ aliter in regnum Dei intrare, quam ut deponerent mortalitatem  
 ‘ prioris vitæ. Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filii Dei signati sunt, et  
 ‘ intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo no-  
 ‘ men Filii Dei, morti destinatus est: at ubi accipit illud sigillum,  
 ‘ liberatur a morte et traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum aqua est,  
 ‘ in quam descendunt homines morti obligati, ascendunt vero vitæ  
 ‘ assignati. Et illis igitur prædicatum est illud sigillum, et usi  
 ‘ sunt eo ut intrarent in regnum Dei.

‘ Et dixi, Quare ergo, domine, illi quadraginta lapides ascenderunt  
 ‘ cum illis de profundo, jam habentes illud sigillum? et dixit, Quo-  
 ‘ niam hi apostoli et doctores, qui prædicaverunt nomen Filii Dei,  
 ‘ cum habentes fidem ejus et potestatem defuncti essent, prædicave-  
 ‘ runt his qui ante obierunt: et ipsi dederunt eis illud signum.  
 ‘ Descenderunt igitur in aquam cum illis, et iterum ascenderunt.  
 ‘ Sed hi vivi descenderunt<sup>b</sup>: at illi qui fuerunt ante defuncti, mortui  
 ‘ quidem descenderunt, sed vivi ascenderunt. Per hos igitur vitam  
 ‘ receperunt et cognoverunt Filium Dei; ideoque ascenderunt cum  
 ‘ eis, et convenerunt in structuram turris. Nec circumcisi, sed  
 ‘ integri ædificati sunt, quoniam æquitate pleni cum summa casti-  
 ‘ tate defuncti sunt: sed tantummodo hoc sigillum defuerat eis.  
 ‘ Habes horum explanationem.’

‘ But, sir, what are those stones that were taken out of the deep  
 ‘ and fitted into the building?

‘ The ten, said he, which were laid in the foundation, are the first  
 ‘ age: the next twenty-five, the second age, of righteous men. The  
 ‘ next thirty-five, are the prophets and ministers of the Lord: and  
 ‘ the forty are the apostles and teachers of the preaching of the Son  
 ‘ of God. Why, said I, did these stones come up out of the deep  
 ‘ to be placed in the building of this tower, since they had the just  
 ‘ spirits before? (viz. of justice, temperance, chastity, &c., which he  
 ‘ had mentioned before.)

‘ It was necessary, said he, for them to come up by (or through)  
 ‘ water, that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise  
 ‘ enter into the kingdom of God, than by putting off the mortality  
 ‘ of their former life: they therefore, after they were dead, were

<sup>b</sup> [Cotelerius reads in the text *ascenderunt*, and gives in the margin as a conjecture,  
 f. ‘descenderunt et iterum vivi ascenderunt.’]

' sealed with the seal of the Son of God, and so entered into the kingdom of God. For before any one receives the name of the Son of God, he is liable to death : but when he receives that seal, he is delivered from death, and is assigned to life. Now that seal is water, into which persons go down liable to death, but come out of it assigned to life. For which reason to these also was this seal preached ; and they made use of it that they might enter into the kingdom of God.

' And I said, Why then, sir, did those forty stones which had already that seal, come up with them out of the deep ?

' He answered, Because these apostles and teachers that preached the name of the Son of God, dying after they had received his faith and power, preached to them that were dead before, and gave to them this seal. For that reason they went down into the water with them, and came up again. But these last were alive before they went down : but they that died formerly, went down dead, but came up again alive. So that it was by the means of these, that they received life, and knew the Son of God : and accordingly they came up with them, and fitted in the building of the tower. And they were not hewed, but put in whole, because they died in great purity, being full of righteousness : only this seal was wanting to them. So you have the meaning of these things.'

III. When he says, that ' the seal of the Son of God is necessary for their entering into the kingdom of God ;' and that ' that seal is water,' it is plainly an expression of that sentence or definition of our Saviour, which St. John did afterward put into writing in these words, *Except a man* (so it is in the English, but the original is, *ἐὰν μὴ τις*, except one, or except any person) *be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*<sup>c</sup>.

I say afterward, because this book was written before St. John wrote his Gospel, as I shall shew. And though Hermas here speaks of the apostles indefinitely, as being dead ; it is to be understood of the major part of them : for St. John was not dead.

IV. The passage itself, which represents the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament to stand in need of baptism, and of the apostles preaching the name of Christ to them after they were dead, before they could be capable of entering the kingdom of God, does indeed seem strange to us, and is the oddest passage in all the book. But we must consider it is represented by way of vision,

<sup>c</sup> John iii. 5.



where every thing is not to be taken in a proper sense: yet Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived about one hundred years after this book was written<sup>d</sup>, cites this passage, and takes it for real matter of fact. And those texts, 1 Pet. iii. 19. and iv. 6, which speak of *the gospel being preached to them that were dead*, though they be now by most protestants understood in another sense, were by most of the ancients<sup>e</sup> understood in a sense like to this.

This passage does also lead one to think anew of St. Paul's mentioning a practice of some men in those times being *baptized for the dead*<sup>f</sup>. A thing that has never yet been agreed on in what sense it is to be understood. Of the explications that are, I give some accounts hereafter.

There is, if we compare this passage with those sayings of the apostles, something like, and something unlike. St. Peter mentioning the gospel *preached to the dead*, (if he be so to be understood,) makes it to be done by Jesus Christ himself in or by the Spirit: which Hermas represents as done by the apostles after they were dead; and Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>h</sup> by both: for he makes Christ to have preached to the deceased just men of the Jewish nation; and the apostles to the deceased heathen men. St. Paul speaks of some persons baptized for the dead; but Hermas in the way of vision represents the dead themselves that died under the Old Testament, to be baptized in the name of Christ. And Origen<sup>i</sup> speaks much to the same purpose as Hermas.

But whether these were true visions, or only the author's sense given under such a representation, still the scope of the place is to represent the necessity of water-baptism to salvation, or to entrance into the kingdom of God, in the opinion of the then Christians, i. e. the Christians of the apostles' times. Since even they that were dead before the institution of baptism in the name of Christ, are in way of vision represented as incapable of the kingdom of God without it.

*Hermas Pastor*, lib. iii. Similitud. 9. c. 29.

V. He having there spoken of martyrs, confessors, and some other degrees of Christians, comes to speak of a sort of harmless people, represented there by the white colour, who have always been as little children; and adds these words:

‘Quicunque ergo permanserint, inquit, sicut infantes, non habentes malitiam, honoratiores erunt omnibus illis quos jam dixi.

<sup>d</sup> Strom. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Iren. lib. v. c. 31. Clem. Alex. Strom.

6. Origen. c. Cels. lib. ii. Tertull. de

Anima, c. 7.

<sup>g</sup> Chap. xxi. s. iii.

<sup>i</sup> Hom. in Luc. xiv.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 29.

<sup>h</sup> Loc. citat.

‘ Omnes enim infantes honorati sunt apud Dominum, et primi habentur.’

‘ Whosoever therefore shall continue as infants, without malice, shall be more honourable than all those of whom I have yet spoken. For all infants are valued by the Lord, and esteemed first of all.’

This being to the same effect as our Saviour’s embracing infants, and saying, *Of such is the kingdom of God*, is one of the reasons used to prove that they are fit to be admitted into the covenant of God’s grace and love by baptism. And whereas the antipædobaptists expound our Saviour’s words, not of children themselves, but of men that are of an innocent temper like children: not only that is affirmed here, but it is moreover said of the infants themselves, that they are greatly valued and esteemed of God.

VI. These books of Clement and Hermas, when, after they had in the ignorant age lain hid and unminded, they came again into the hands of learned men, were at first questioned, whether they were the genuine pieces of those authors, and the same that Eusebius<sup>k</sup> testifies to have been reckoned by many for books of holy scripture, and to have been read in many churches accordingly. But after that so many quotations of them by the ancients have been examined, and found to be *verbatim* the same, there is no longer doubt of that matter. They were accounted divinely inspired by some, but rejected from that rank by others. They may therefore very well pass for the two Apocryphal books of the New Testament, as Tobit, &c. are of the Old: and so they are reckoned by Eusebius<sup>l</sup>, Rufinus<sup>m</sup>, &c. The greater commendation is due to the pains of our present most reverend metropolitan<sup>n</sup>, for putting them and some other of the most ancient pieces into the hands of the English reader: and the more preposterous is the humour of many, that prefer the reading of modern things before them.

VII. I said that these books were written before St. John wrote his Gospel, which may be made appear thus: St. John lived to sixty-eight years after our Saviour’s passion, viz. to the year of Christ 101, as is attested by St. Hierome, who says it in two places<sup>o</sup>, and in one of them says, ‘ that the church histories do most plainly shew it.’ And it is certain he cannot be mistaken considerably, because Irenæus, who often recounts how greedily he had

<sup>k</sup> Eccl. Hist. lib. iii. c. 3 et 16.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid.

<sup>m</sup> In Symbolum.

<sup>n</sup> [Archbishop Wake, who published The General Epistles of the Apostolical

Fathers, translated, &c. 8vo. 1693: the second edition, corrected and improved, 8vo. 1710; third edit. 1719.]

<sup>o</sup> De Script. Eccl. et lib. i. contra Jovinian.

in his younger years heard Polycarp discourse of St. John and his affairs, and of the conferences he had had with him, says in several places<sup>p</sup>, ‘that St. John continued to the times of Trajan;’ and the year of Christ 101 is but the third year of Trajan. And it is agreed by all, that he wrote his Gospel but a very little before his death.

It is true indeed, that St. John seems, ch. v. 2, to speak of Jerusalem as if it were then standing. But many learned men understand these words, *There is at Jerusalem*, &c., that is, in the place where Jerusalem was, or in the ruins; as if one had said during the ruins of London, *There is in Cheapside a conduit*.

The current tradition is, that he wrote it upon his return to Ephesus, after that violent persecution of Christians in the fourteenth year of Domitian, anno Dom. 94, remembered by all writers. In that persecution St. John was banished into the island Patmos, *for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ*<sup>q</sup>: where he had that vision or Revelation which he has published, which Irenæus shews to have been in the latter end of Domitian’s reign in these words: ‘We will not run the hazard of affirming any thing ‘positively concerning the name of Antichrist,’ signified by the number 666; ‘for if it had been expedient to be published plainly ‘at present, it would have been expressed by him himself that saw ‘the vision: since it is not very long ago that it was seen; being ‘but a little before our time, at the latter end of Domitian’s reign<sup>r</sup>.’

Domitian dying anno 96, and Nerva, a mild prince, succeeding, the prisoners and banished men were released: and St. John returned to Ephesus, where, as Irenæus<sup>s</sup> and Athanasius<sup>t</sup> testify, he wrote his Gospel. And St. Hierome mentions the occasion of it<sup>u</sup>; ‘He, last of all the rest, wrote his Gospel, being entreated so to do ‘by the bishops of Asia, against Cerinthus and other heretics, and ‘especially the then new sprung up opinion of the Ebionites, who ‘affirm, that Christ had no being before Mary; for which reason ‘he thought it needful to discourse concerning his divine nativity ‘also.’ And this is, as to the main, confirmed out of Irenæus himself; for he says that ‘he wrote it at Ephesus<sup>x</sup>:’ and, that ‘he ‘aimed thereby to extirpate the error which had been sowed in the ‘minds of men by Cerinthus<sup>y</sup>.’ These things are reported by such men as had the opportunity of easily knowing the truth in such matters of fact.

Now for the age of these books of Clement and Hermas, one need only inquire for the time of Clement’s death: for Hermas

<sup>p</sup> Lib. ii. c. 39. et lib. iii. c. 3.    <sup>q</sup> Rev. i. 9.    <sup>r</sup> Lib. v. c. 30.    <sup>s</sup> Lib. iii. c. 1.  
<sup>t</sup> In Synopsi.    <sup>u</sup> De Script. Eccl. v. Joan.    <sup>x</sup> Lib. iii. c. 1.    <sup>y</sup> Lib. iii. c. 11.



wrote his while Clement was living and bishop of the church at Rome, and mentions him therein as such <sup>z</sup>. And though the time of Clement's death be not so exactly to be discovered from the ancients, but that they that have gone about to settle it have varied; and some from others twenty years: yet they that have placed it the latest, have placed it as soon as St. John's death is placed by those that have placed that the soonest, viz. anno 101: for in giving that date of St. John's death, I gave the earliest that is pitched upon. St. Chrysostom and the Chronicon Alexandr. make him live some years longer.

The two that of late have made the most exact disquisition about the time of St. Clement, are bishop Pearson and Mr. Dodwell. Bishop Pearson<sup>a</sup> having found by undeniable proofs that the times of Hyginus, bishop of Rome, are set too low in the chronological tables by fifteen or twenty, or (as some writers place him) thirty years, and that he must have entered upon his office anno 122 at the latest, does proportionably set all the foregoing bishops higher: and so he has made St. Clement come into the bishopric immediately after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul, which he places anno 68, (thirty-five years after our Saviour's passion,) and to continue alive till the year 83. And he supposes Linus and Anencletus, who are commonly placed before St. Clement, to have been no otherwise bishops there, than as they acted under the said apostles in their lifetime.

Mr. Dodwell<sup>b</sup> judges that after the said apostle's death, which he places anno 64, Linus was bishop, and after him Anencletus. But that they both died in a very short time, about a year; and that Clement succeeded anno 65, and continued to 81. By either of these accounts Clement was dead a great while before St. John had wrote any of his books.

VIII. But there is a passage in Irenæus (whose authority every one owns to be in this matter beyond compare) wherein the time of Clement's succession, and the distance thereof from the time of those apostles, is purposely insisted on: and that though it mention not the years, yet as it supposes his entry on that office to be nigher St. Peter and St. Paul's time than some had placed it, so it will by no means suffer him to be placed so early, as to succeed within a year or two after their death. It is lib. iii. c. 3, where he is confuting that plea of the Valentinians, (heretics that held that there is another God, superior to him that created the world,)

<sup>z</sup> Lib. i. Vis. 2. c. 4.

<sup>a</sup> Pearsoni Opera posthuma Chronolog. Dissert. ii.

<sup>b</sup> Dissertatio sing. de Success. Rom. Pont. c. 11, 12, &c.



whereby they pretended to have this doctrine by tradition from the apostles ; who would not write it, nor tell it to every body, but to some more perfect disciples, by whose hands it came to them. The words are these ;

‘ It is easy for any one that would be guided by truth, to know the tradition of the apostles, declared in all the world. And we are able to reckon up those that were placed bishops by the apostles in the several churches, and their successors, to this time ; who never taught nor knew any such thing as these men dream of. Now the apostles, if they had known of any deep mysteries which they would communicate to those that were perfect, privately and by themselves, would have taught them to those men sooner than any, to whom they committed the churches : for they desired that such should be very perfect in every thing, and wanting in nothing ; whom they left as their successors, delivering to them their own place of government. Since, if these men did well, there would ensue great advantage ; but if they miscarried, great mischief.

‘ But it being a long business in such a book as this, to reckon up the successions of all the churches : if we shew the tradition left by the apostles, and the faith taught the Christians derived by successions of bishops to our time, in that church which is one of the greatest and most ancient, and known to every body, founded and built by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul ; we shall shame all those who by self-conceit or vainglory, or by ignorance and mistaken opinion, hold things that they ought not. For every church, I mean the Christians of all places round about, have necessary occasions to come to this church, by reason that the government and power is there, (meaning the seat of the empire,) and so in this church the tradition of the apostles is always preserved, by means of those that from all places resort thither.

‘ The blessed apostles, then, having founded and built this church, delivered over to Linus the office of the bishopric. This Linus, Paul mentions in his Epistles to Timothy<sup>c</sup>.

‘ The next to him is Anencletus.

‘ After him, in the third place from the apostles, Clement comes into the bishopric, who had both seen the blessed apostles and conferred with them, and had the preaching and tradition of the apostles as yet sounding in his ears ; and that, not he alone ; for there were many then left alive who had been personally taught by the apostles. It was under this Clement that a great dissen-

'sion happening among the brethren that were at Corinth, the church that was at Rome sent a most powerful epistle to the Corinthians, persuading them to peace, stirring up their faith anew, and declaring to them the tradition which they had lately received from the apostles, which teaches, that there is but one God Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, Creator of man, &c.— And that the same God is declared by the churches to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whoso will may see, *ex ipsa scriptura*, by that scripture (or writing) itself, and may understand the apostolical tradition of the church: for that epistle is older than they are that now teach these false doctrines, and invent another God above the Creator and Maker of the things that are seen.' He proceeds to name the bishops from Clement to Eleutherus, who was then bishop, the twelfth from the apostles; and to appeal to the church of Smyrna, which had had Polycarp: and to the church of Ephesus, which had had St. John so lately living among them; and that none of these had taught or pretended to know of any of those secret traditions that these men set up.

Now, when it was for his purpose to shew how near Clement and this epistle of his were to the times of St. Peter and St. Paul, and he says no more, but that Clement had seen and heard them, and that several others were then alive beside him, that had done the like; he plainly supposes that they had been dead a considerable time. For we never speak so of men that have been dead but a year or two. When we say, 'There are many yet alive that can remember such a man, and have conversed with him;' a stander by will conclude we speak of one that has been dead a good while; it may be fifteen or twenty years. And yet even so, if we reckon with Eusebius<sup>d</sup> and other ancient accounts, that Clement held the seat but nine years, he will yet die before St. John, and before the time when, by all accounts, he wrote his Gospel.

This also is considerable; that Clement, who quotes many places out of other books of the New Testament, seems never to have seen any of St. John's writings.

Therefore, though bishop Pearson has convinced every body that Hyginus is to be placed as he has placed him; yet it seems improbable that Clement should have been bishop so soon as he places him. Rather, some years are to be taken from the times of the bishops that were between those two.

IX. For the same reason, I think it very improbable that this

<sup>d</sup> Chronic. it. Hist. lib. iii. c. 34.

Clement was the Clement mentioned, Phil. iv. 3, as St. Paul's fellow labourer, when he was at Rome the first time, six years before his martyrdom; though Eusebius<sup>e</sup>, St. Jerome<sup>f</sup>, and Epiphanius do guess him to be the same. For would not Irenæus have mentioned that, instead of saying what he does? It was much more to his purpose, than to observe the like of Linus, of whose authority he makes no such use.

And more improbable it is, that this Hermas should be the same whom St. Paul salutes as his acquaintance eleven years before he died, Rom. xvi. 14, though Origen<sup>g</sup> guess it to be he; and Eusebius<sup>h</sup> and St. Jerome<sup>i</sup> tell us that several thought so. For this Hermas, as he was no young man, because he had children<sup>k</sup> then guilty of fornication, so he was no very old man when he wrote; because he mentions the woman<sup>l</sup> that had been brought up with him, as a woman of such great beauty at that time. To conclude men to be the same, because of the same name, as it is very obvious, so it is of little weight.

And if they be not judged to be the same, nor to have had any such familiarity with the apostles, but only to have seen or heard them, &c., then that argument falls to the ground of those that say, These books are either spurious, and then, Why do we regard them? Or else, if they be counted genuine, why are they not put into the canon, as well as the writings of St. Luke and St. Mark? St. Mark and St. Luke were for certain contemporaries, companions, and intimate acquaintance with the apostles for a long time of their life: the same is not certain, and I believe not true of the authors of these books; though it be plain that they lived in the apostles' age, and wrote before the death of St. John.

## CHAP. II.

*Quotations out of Justin Martyr.*

*Dialog. cum Tryphone, sect. 88.*

§ I. ΚΑΙ οὐχ' ὥς ἐνδεᾶ αὐτὸν τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, ἢ τοῦ ἐπελθόντος ἐν  
 40. εἶδει περιστερᾶς πνεύματος, οἶδαμεν αὐτὸν ἐληλυθέναι ἐπὶ  
 (A. D. 140.) τὸν ποταμόν· ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὸ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ σταυρω-  
 θῆναι ὥς ἐνδεῆς τούτων ὑπέμεινεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώ-  
 πων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ Ὁφείως ἐπεπτώκει,  
 παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένου.

<sup>e</sup> H. E. lib. iii. cap. 12.

<sup>f</sup> De Script. Eccl. v. Clemens.

<sup>g</sup> Hom. in Rom. xvi. <sup>h</sup> Lib. iii. c. 3.

<sup>i</sup> De Script. Eccl. v. Hermas.

<sup>k</sup> Lib. i. Vis. 2. c. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. i. Vis. 1



‘ And we know that he did not go to Jordan, as having any need of being baptized, or of the Spirit’s coming on him in shape of a dove. As also, neither did he submit to be born and to be crucified, as being under any necessity of those things. But he did this for mankind, which by Adam was fallen under death, and under the guile of the serpent, beside the peculiar guilt of each of them who had sinned.’

I recite this only to shew that in these times, so very near the apostles, they spoke of original sin affecting all mankind descended of Adam; and understood, that, besides the actual sins of each particular person, there is in our nature itself, since the fall, something that needs redemption and forgiveness by the merits of Christ. And that is ordinarily applied to every particular person by baptism. In answer to the exceptions made against my translating *παρὰ* here by *præter*, I have, in a Defence which I have been forced to write since the second edition, shewn that all whom I have seen, and I believe absolutely all, who have translated this place, have so rendered it. And that Justin’s ordinary phrase, and particularly in this dialogue, is to use it so.

*Dialog. cum Tryphone, sect. 43.*

II. Καὶ ἡμεῖς, οἱ διὰ τούτου προσχωρήσαντες τῷ Θεῷ, οὐ ταύτην τὴν κατὰ σάρκα παρελάβομεν περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, ἣν Ἐνὼχ καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι ἐφύλαξαν· ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτὴν, ἐπειδὴ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐγεγόνημεν, διὰ τοῦ ἔλεος τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλάβομεν· καὶ πᾶσιν ἔφετον ὁμοίως λαμβάνειν.

‘ We also who by him have had access to God, have not received this carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision, which Enoch, and those like him observed. And we have received it by baptism, by the mercy of God, because we were sinners; and it is allowed to all persons to receive it by the same way.’

It is plain that this most ancient father does here speak of baptism being to Christians in the stead of circumcision; and the analogy between these two is one of the arguments used by the pædobaptists to prove that one ought to be given to infants, as well as the other was. It is to the same sense, as is that saying of St. Paul, where he calls baptism, with the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which attends it, *the circumcision of Christ*, (or as it would be more intelligibly rendered, the Christian circumcision,) in these words: *In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism<sup>m</sup>. For by*

<sup>m</sup> Col. ii. 11, 12.



those words, *the circumcision of Christ*, must be understood either that action by which Christ himself in his infancy was circumcised; and it is no sense to say, that the Colossians were circumcised with that; or else, that circumcision which Christ has appointed, the Christian circumcision; and with that he says they were circumcised, being buried with him by baptism. Only he, as well as Justin, refers both to the inward and outward part of baptism; whereof the inward part is done without hands: and accordingly the ancients were wont to call baptism, περιτομὴν ἀχειροποίητον, ‘the circumcision done without hands;’ as will appear by some following quotations<sup>n</sup>. So that it seems hard for the antipædobaptists to maintain, as some of them do, that the scripture and ancient Christians do not make any resemblance between these two sacraments.

The paraphrase given of this text of St. Paul, in the Quæst. ad Orthodox. ascribed to Justin Martyr, q. 102, is this: the question there is, ‘Why, if circumcision were a good thing, we do not use it as well as the Jews did?’ The answer is, ‘We are circumcised by baptism with Christ’s circumcision,’ &c. And he brings this text for his proof.

*Justinì Apologia prima (vulgo secunda) ad Antoninum Pium°.*

III. This holy man and good martyr of Jesus Christ does in this Apology, presented to the emperor and senate in behalf of the Christians, vindicate them from the absurd and abominable slanders which the people raised on them; as that they did in their assemblies eat young children, and commit promiscuous fornication, &c. And having spoke of their doctrine and conversation, and shewn that they neither believed nor practised any such mischievous things as were reported, he proceeds to speak of the two most solemn rites that they used, viz. of initiating or entering the converts that came to them by baptism; and of confirming their faith by receiving the Lord’s Supper. And of baptism says thus: ‘Οὐ τρόπον δὲ καὶ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, καινοποιηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξηγησόμεθα· ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο παραλιπόντες δόξωμεν πονηρεῦν τι ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει. “Οσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῇ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα, εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὐχέσθαι τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συννευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. Ἐπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ’ ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννώμενται. Ἐπ’ ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότην Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε

<sup>n</sup> See ch. xii. s. iii. ch. xiv. s. i.

° Prope finem.

λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, \**Ὁ μὴ ἀναγεννηθῇτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*· ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσιν ἐστι. Καὶ διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ Προφήτου, ὡς προεγράψαμεν, εἴρηται, τίνα τρόπον φεύξονται τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οἱ ἁμαρτήσαντες καὶ μετανοοῦντες, ἐλέχθη δὲ οὕτως, Λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε, &c.—Καὶ λόγον δὲ εἰς τοῦτο παρὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐμάθομεν τοῦτον· ἐπειδὴ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγνοοῦντες κατ' ἀνάγκην γεγεννημέθα ἐξ ὑγρᾶς σπορᾶς κατὰ μίξιν τὴν τῶν γονέων κατ' ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἐν ἔθεσι φαύλοις καὶ πονηραῖς ἀνατροφαῖς γεγόναμεν, ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τέκνα μὴδ' ἀγνοίας μένωμεν, ἀλλὰ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης, ἀφέσεώς τε ἁμαρτιῶν ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν τύχωμεν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, ἐπονομάζεται τῷ ἐλομένῳ ἀναγεννηθῆναι καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότης Θεοῦ ὄνομα, &c. Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμόςP.

‘ I will now declare to you also after what manner we being made  
 ‘ new by Christ [or baptized] have dedicated ourselves to God :  
 ‘ lest, if I should leave out that, I might seem to deal unfairly in  
 ‘ some part of my apology. They who are persuaded and do believe  
 ‘ that those things which are taught by us are true, and do promise  
 ‘ to live according to them, are directed first to pray and ask of  
 ‘ God with fasting, the forgiveness of their former sins : and we  
 ‘ also pray and fast together with them. Then we bring them to  
 ‘ some place where there is water ; and they are regenerated by the  
 ‘ same way of regeneration by which we were regenerated : for they  
 ‘ are washed with water in the name of God, the Father and Lord  
 ‘ of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy  
 ‘ Spirit. For Christ says, *Unless ye be regenerated, ye cannot enter*  
 ‘ *into the kingdom of heaven* : and every body knows it is impossible  
 ‘ for those that are once generated [or born] to enter again into  
 ‘ their mother’s womb.

‘ It was foretold by the prophet Isaiah<sup>r</sup>, as I said, by what means  
 ‘ they who would repent of their sins might escape them : and was  
 ‘ written in these words ; *Wash you, make you clean, put away the*  
 ‘ *evil*, &c.

‘ And we have been taught by the apostles this word [or this  
 ‘ reason] for this thing : because we, being ignorant of our first  
 ‘ birth, were generated by necessity [or course of nature] of the  
 ‘ humid seed of our parents mixing together, and have been brought  
 ‘ up in ill customs and conversation ; that we should not continue  
 ‘ children of that necessity and ignorance, but of will, [or choice,]  
 ‘ and knowledge, and should obtain forgiveness of the sins in which

P Apol. I. s. 61.

q John iii. 5.

r Isai. i. 16.

‘ we have lived, by water, [or in the water.] There is invoked, over him that has a mind to be regenerated, the name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, &c.—And this washing is called *‘ the enlightening,’* &c.

If I am asked to what purpose I bring in this in a discourse of infant baptism; my answer is, that I do not produce it as making directly or immediately either for or against it. He being here to shew that the ceremony of entering proselytes that came to them from the heathens, had no ill thing in it, had no occasion to speak of the case of infants. But I bring it,

I. Because it is the most ancient account of the way of baptizing, next the scripture; and shews the plain and simple manner of administering it. The Christians of these times had lived, many of them at least, in the apostles’ days.

IV. 2. Because it shews that the Christians of these times used the word *regeneration* [or being born again] for baptism: and that they were taught so to do by the apostles. And it will appear by the multitude of places I shall produce, that they used it as customarily, and appropriated it as much to signify baptism, as we do the word *christening*. They used also ἀνακαινισμός or καινοποιία, ‘renewing,’ and φωτισμός, ‘enlightening,’ for the same thing: as appears by the first and last words of this passage.

And thirdly, because we see by it, that they understood that rule of our Saviour, *Except one be regenerated [or born again] of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, of water-baptism; and concluded from it, that without such baptism, no person could come to heaven. And so did all the writers of these 400 years, not one man excepted.

V. This is of the more use to note, because many modern writers use the word *regeneration*, or *new-birth*, for repentance and conversion, whether it be accompanied with baptism at that time or not. But the ancients do not so. The scripture also uses it for baptism: *The washing of regeneration*, Tit. iii. 5, is the washing of baptism.

And I shewed before in the introduction, that this phrase was not first used by our Saviour or his apostles: but that it was a usual word of the Jews, to denote that baptism by which any proselyte was baptized unto Moses.

*Justin Martyr, Apol. I. (vulgo 2da) prope ab initio.*

VI. Καὶ πολλοὶ τινες καὶ πολλὰ ἐξηκοντοῦται καὶ ἐβδομηκοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένονσι. ‘Several persons among us of sixty and seventy years old, of both sexes,



‘who were discipled [or made disciples] to Christ in, or from their childhood, do continue uncorrupted [or virgins.]’

St. Justin’s word, ἐμαθητεύθησαν, ‘were discipled, or made disciples,’ is the very same word that had been used by St. Matthew in expressing our Saviour’s command, μαθητεύσατε, *disciple* [or, make disciples] *all the nations*. And it was done to these persons, Justin says, in or from their childhood. So that whereas the anti-pædobaptists do say, that when our Saviour bids the apostles *disciple the nations, baptizing them*; he cannot mean infants; because he must be understood to bid them baptize only such among the nations as could be made disciples; and infants, they say, cannot be made disciples. They may perceive that in the sense in which Justin understood the word, they may be made disciples. And Justin wrote but ninety years after St. Matthew, who wrote about fifteen years after Christ’s ascension. And they that were seventy years old at this time must have been made disciples to Christ in their childhood, (as he says they were,) about thirty-six years after the ascension; that is, in the midst of the apostles’ times, and within twenty years after St. Matthew’s writing.

### CHAP. III.

*Quotations out of St. Irenæus and Clemens Alexandrinus.*

§ I. IRENÆUS does in many places speak of original sin, as affecting ‘all mankind<sup>a</sup>,’ all our ‘race<sup>b</sup>,’ putting them (A.D. 167.) in a state of ‘debtors to God, transgressors, and enemies ‘to him<sup>c</sup>,’ ‘under the stroke of the serpent, and addicted to death<sup>d</sup>,’ And that it is only in and through Christ that they have ‘reconciliation and redemption<sup>e</sup>.’ He also so speaks of baptism, as of the means or instrument by which this redemption is conveyed and applied to any one, and calls it by the name of λύτρωσις and ἀπολύτρωσις, ‘redemption<sup>f</sup>.’

But though this laid together do make an argument for the baptizing all persons, infants as well as others, yet I shall pass by this and other such places in this and other authors, that speak of original sin, and the necessity of baptism only in general: intending henceforward to recite such only as do more directly and immediately concern infants, and speak of their baptism; either for or against it.

<sup>a</sup> Lib. contra Hær. v. c. 19.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. iv. c. 5. et lib. v. c. 19.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. c. 21.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. iii. c. 20.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. c. 16.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. i. c. 18.



*Irenæus adv. Hæreses*, lib. ii. c. 39. (edit. Grabe; but cap. 22. s. 4. in ed. Benedict. 1710.) speaking of Christ.

II. ‘Magister ergo existens Magistri quoque habebat ætatem. Non reprobans nec supergrediens hominem, neque solvens [suam] legem in se humani generis: sed omnem ætatem sanctificans per illam quæ ad ipsum erat similitudinem. Omnes enim venit per semet ipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum; infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem: et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes: in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem; simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus, et justitiæ et subjectionis: in juvenibus juvenis,’ &c.

‘Therefore as he was a Master, he had also the age of a Master. Not disdaining nor going in a way above human nature; nor breaking in his own person the law which he had set for mankind: but sanctifying every several age by the likeness that it has to him. For he came to save all persons by himself: all, I mean, who by him are regenerated [or baptized] unto God; infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons. Therefore he went through the several ages: for infants being made an infant, sanctifying infants: to little ones he was made a little one, sanctifying those of that age; and also giving them an example of godliness, justice, and dutifulness: to youths he was a youth,’ &c.

This testimony, which reckons infants among those that are regenerated, is plain and full; provided the reader be one that is satisfied that the word *regeneration* does, in the usual phrase of those times, signify baptism: and this cannot be doubted by any that are at all acquainted with the books of those ages. As for those that are not, I have already had occasion to refer<sup>s</sup> them to the use of the Jews before and in Christ’s time, and to some places of scripture: and it may be worth the while to turn back to the passage of Justin Martyr last quoted, (he lived but thirty or forty years before this man,) and to observe how he uses the word. The reader will also see, in almost all the passages that I shall have occasion to produce, the same use of the word constantly observed; that to say *regenerated* is with them as much as to say *baptized*.

III. At present take these three evidences of it: 1. Irenæus himself uses it so in all other places of his book that I have ever observed: as for instance, l. iii. c. 19, [c. 17. 1.] where he is pro-

ducing testimonies of scripture concerning the Holy Spirit, he has this; ‘Et iterum, potestatem regenerationis in Deum dans discipulis, dicebat eis,’ &c. And again, when he gave his disciples the commission of regenerating unto God, he said unto them, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* Where the commission of regenerating plainly means the commission of baptizing.

And l. i. c. 18. [c. 21. 1.] Concerning the Valentinian heretics, who altered and corrupted both the form of Christian baptism and the manner of administering it, (of which corruptions I have occasion to speak particularly hereafter, chap. xxi. s. ii. and part ii. ch. v. s. i.) he says,

*Eis ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπόθεσιν, ὑποβέβληται τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ.* ‘This generation of heretics has been sent out by Satan for the frustrating [or denying] of the baptism of regeneration unto God, [i. e. the true Christian baptism, instead of which they set up a mock baptism of their own,] and the destruction of our whole faith [or religion].’ And it appears by the following parts of the chapter, that the Valentinians also aped the Christians in calling their mock-baptism by the name of regeneration and redemption, *λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι—ἵνα εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα Δύναμιν ᾧσιν ἀναγεγεννημένοι.* ‘They say that it [their way of baptism] is necessary for all true Gnostics, that they may be regenerated unto that power which is above all, i. e. above the God of the Christians.’

And l. v. c. 15. [c. 15. 3.] speaking of the blind man whom our Saviour cured by clay and spittle, and bade him wash in the pool of Siloam; and calling this application of clay, and this washing, in an allegorical way, a creation, or new formation of his eye; and a baptism; he styles that washing, *lavacrum regenerationis*, ‘the washing of regeneration.’ And a little after, ‘Simul et plasmationem et eam quæ est per lavacrum regenerationem restituens ei.’ He gave to him at the same time his formation [viz. that of his eye] and that regeneration which is by the laver [viz. baptism].

And l. iv. c. 59. [c. 33. 4.] disputing against the Ebionites, (who denied our Saviour to have been conceived in the womb in any miraculous manner, but thought him to have been begotten by Joseph in the ordinary way,) he asks them, how they think to escape the generation of death, [or the curse attending the natural generation,] if they do not believe that new way of generation which was foretold to Ahaz, (*Behold, a virgin shall conceive,*) and so

‘eam recipiant quæ est per fidem regenerationem,’ ‘receive that regeneration [or baptism] which is by the faith [or creed]?’

This place is mangled in the old copy. And Dr. Grabe<sup>b</sup> shews that the sense requires the words *eam recipiant quæ est* to be restored in the blank. And it is to be noted that the ancient creeds always had that clause, of the conception of a virgin, in opposition to these Ebionites. And a common name for the creed was (as Mr. Bingham shews) Πίστις, ‘the faith.’ According to which faith Irenæus advises the Ebionites to receive their baptism.

As the ancients, when they speak of regeneration as applied to a person in this world, do always by that word mean, or connote, his baptism; so when they speak of the regeneration of the world itself, or the earth, they mean its restitution or renovation after the day of judgment; which may be called its new birth, or new formation. And in that metaphorical way of speaking, they sometimes call the resurrection of the body its regeneration. So there is one place in Irenæus, lib. v. c. 2, where, by the regeneration of the flesh, one does not know whether he mean the baptism of it in this world, or its resurrection in the world to come. He is there disputing against the Valentinians, and all those sorts of heretics who denied either the truth of Christ’s natural body and its resurrection, or the resurrection of ours; and says, ‘Vani autem omnimodo, qui universam dispositionem Dei contemnunt, et carnis salutem negant, et regenerationem ejus spernunt; dicentes non eam capacem esse incorruptibilitatis.’ ‘They are altogether vain, who undervalue the whole economy of God, and deny any salvation of the flesh [or body] and do slight the regeneration of it; saying that it is not capable of a state of incorruption.’

By their slighting the regeneration of the flesh, he must mean either their denying its resurrection, as many of them did; or else their refusing to give it baptism; which several sects of the Valentinians did, who are mentioned by Irenæus at other places which I recite, part ii. ch. 5. § i. By his making two sentences of it, his meaning seems to be, that they, not believing any resurrection of the body, but that the soul is all that survives, did not think the body worthy of a baptism.

These, and one piece more, are all that I know of, where he uses the word: lib. iii. c. 33. [c. 22. § 4.] He is speaking of Christ, at his descent to Hades, freeing the patriarchs from that power of death, or Hades, under which they had been held: and says, ‘Pri-

<sup>b</sup> [Compare the note of the Benedictine editor on this point.]



‘mogenitus enim mortuorum natus Dominus, et in sinum suum  
 ‘recipiens pristinos patres, regeneravit eos in vitam Dei.’ ‘Our  
 ‘Lord being made the first begotten from the dead, and receiving  
 ‘the ancient patriarchs into his bosom, regenerated them to the  
 ‘life of God.’—And a little after; ‘Hic illos in evangelium vitæ  
 ‘regeneravit.’ ‘He regenerated them to the gospel of life.’

These phrases at this place, he means, I think, as a comment on those texts of St. Peter; *He went and preached to the spirits in prison: and, the gospel preached to those that were dead.* For that he understood them so, is plain by what he says, lib. iv. c. 45. [c. 27. § 2.] ‘Dominum in ea quæ sunt sub terra descendisse, evangelizantem et illis adventum suum,’ &c. Many of the eldest Christians (beside Hermas, whose words I gave before) conceived, that the gospel of life was preached, and baptism in the name of Christ given to the patriarchs in their separate state.

But however that be; in all the places where he uses the word *regeneration*, as applied to the case of any persons in this life, he refers to their baptism. Which confirms that sense of it in the place I first quoted.

IV. 2. There are several sayings both of the Latin and Greek fathers, which do plainly shew that they not only used that word for baptism, but also that they so appropriated it to baptism, as to exclude any other conversion or repentance that is not accompanied with baptism, from being signified by it. As these that follow:

Greg. Nazianzen, when he deters the baptized person from falling back into sinful courses, tells him<sup>i</sup>, ‘There is not another regeneration afterward to be had, though it be sought with never so much ‘crying and tears:’ and yet grants in the next words, that there is repentance after baptism: but shews a difference between that and the free forgiveness given in baptism.

St. Austin being asked, whether a parent carrying his child, which  
<sup>300</sup> had been baptized, to the heathen sacrifices, do thereby  
 (A.D. 400.) obliterate the benefit of his baptism<sup>k</sup>, gives this rule:  
 ‘An infant does never lose the grace of Christ which he has once  
 ‘received, but by his own sinful deeds, if when he grows up he  
 ‘prove so wicked, for then he will begin to have sins of his own,  
 ‘*quæ non regeneratione auferantur, sed alia curatione sanentur*, which  
 ‘are not to be done away by regeneration, but by some other way  
 ‘of cure.’ These kind of sayings do plainly contradistinguish

<sup>i</sup> Orat. 40. prope ab initio. Οὐκ οὔσης δευτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως.

<sup>k</sup> Epist. 23. ad Bonifacium.



regeneration from repentance, conversion, &c. except in case of baptism.

So St. Hierome, discoursing in praise of virginity, has this<sup>1</sup>  
 270. among the rest, that Christ was ‘natus ex virgine,  
 (A.D. 370.) ‘renatus per virginem,’ ‘born of a virgin, and regene-  
 ‘rated by a virgin;’ meaning he was baptized by John, that was  
 unmarried. To say that Christ was regenerated, taking the word,  
 as many modern writers do, for conversion, repentance, &c. would  
 be an impious speech.

And St. Ambrose, *De iis qui initiantur*, c. 4, says<sup>m</sup>, ‘Nec sine  
 274. ‘aqua regenerationis mysterium est,’ ‘There is no re-  
 (A.D. 374.) ‘generation without water.’

St. Austin calls the persons by whose means infants are baptized,  
 ‘eos per quos renascuntur,’ ‘those by whom they are regenerated,’  
 which would be a strange speech in the dialect of some late English  
 writers, who use the word for the conversion of the heart.

V. 3. When Irenæus does here speak of infants regenerated; it  
 is plain enough of itself, that they are not capable of regeneration  
 in any other sense of the word, than as it signifies baptism; I mean  
 the outward act of baptism, accompanied with that grace or mercy  
 of God, whereby he admits them into covenant, though without  
 any sense of theirs.

I shall in the places that I must cite henceforward, where we  
 meet with the word *regeneratus*, *renatus*, &c., translate it *regenerated*,  
 without any further explication; but the reader will find that he  
 must understand by it *baptized*; or else that he will make no sense  
 at all of the place. If any one doubt whether Irenæus by infants  
 does mean children before the use of reason, I refer to the Defence  
 of my book against Mr. Gale and Mr. Whiston, who have suggested  
 the contrary, and do here only advise the following words to be  
 read, where he mentions the benefit of Christ’s example to all the  
 rest, the *parvuli*, the *juvenes*, and the *seniores*, but says no such  
 thing of the infants.

VI. Since this is the first express mention that we have met  
 with of infants baptized, it is worth the while to look back, and  
 consider how near this man was to the apostles’ time. Mr. Dodwell,  
 who has with the greatest care and skill computed his age<sup>n</sup>, makes  
 him to be born in the apostolic age, viz. the year after Christ’s  
 birth 97, four years before St. John died; and that he was chosen

<sup>1</sup> Lib. i. contra Jovinian. circa medium.

<sup>m</sup> [Or. De Mysteriis; vol. ii. p. 325. ed. Benedict.]

<sup>n</sup> Dissertationes ad Irenæum, 8vo. Oxoniz, 1689.

bishop of Lyons anno Dom. 167, which is after the apostles 67. His proofs are too long to repeat here. So much is plain, that he wrote the book I here quote within eighty years after the apostles, and that he was then a very old man. For he wrote the two first of his five books against heresies first, and published them<sup>o</sup>, in which these words are; and he published his third book in the time of Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, for he mentions him as then bishop<sup>p</sup>. Eleutherus's time is set by bishop Pearson<sup>q</sup> from the year of Christ 170 to 185; but by Mr. Dodwell<sup>r</sup> from 162 to 177. So that the year of Christ 180 is the latest that the two first books can well be supposed to have been written. Therefore whether we agree or not with Mr. Dodwell, that he was born before St. John's death; yet it could be but very little after, by the age he must be of when he wrote. And besides, he himself says<sup>s</sup>, as I also recited before, that the Revelation made to St. John in Patmos, was 'but a little before his time,' and that Revelation was five or six years before St. John died. The learned man<sup>t</sup> that has given the last edition of his works, though he differ from Mr. Dodwell, yet makes him born but six years after St. John's death. Every body that was at this time eighty years old must have been born in the apostles' time. Irenæus's parents must have been born then, if he were not himself.

I shall say no more, but leave it to every body to judge whether it were possible for the church then to be ignorant what was done as to the baptizing of infants in the apostles' time; when many then living, and the parents of most then living, were themselves infants in that time. Yet this I may add, that Irenæus, though at this time he lived in France, being bishop of Lyons, yet was brought up in Asia, (where St. John had died but a little before,) and probably born of Christian parents. For he had in his younger years often heard Polycarp (who was St. John's acquaintance, and was<sup>u</sup> chosen by him bishop of Smyrna, and was probably that *angel* [or bishop] of the church of Smyrna that is so much commended Rev. ii. 8.) discourse of St. John and his teaching. This he relates of himself in his Epistle to Florinus<sup>x</sup>: and he says, he remembers the thing as if it were but yesterday: for, says he, 'I remember the things that were done then, better than I do those of later times,

<sup>o</sup> Vide Prolog. lib. iii.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. c. 3.

<sup>q</sup> Pearsoni Opera Posthuma, 4to. Londini, 1688.

<sup>r</sup> Dissert. sing. de Rom. Pontif. Successione, c. 14 et 15. [This dissertation of Dodwell is subjoined to Bishop Pear-

son's Opera Posthuma.] <sup>s</sup> Lib. v. c. 30.

<sup>t</sup> [Dr. Grabe; for the Benedictine edition had not appeared in 1705, the year in which this was printed.]

<sup>u</sup> Iren. lib. iii. c. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Apud Euseb. Hist. lib. v. c. 19.

‘ (which is the property of old men,) so that I could describe the place where he sat, and his going out and coming in, his manner of life, his features, his discourse to the people concerning the conversation he had had with John, and others that had seen our Lord; how he rehearsed their discourses, and what he had heard them that were eyewitnesses of the word of life, say of our Lord, and of his miracles and doctrine: all agreeable to the scriptures.’

In an age so nigh the apostles, and in a place where one of them had so lately lived, the Christians could not be ignorant what had been done in their time in a matter so public and notorious as is the baptizing or not baptizing of infants.

VII. It is to be noted, that this testimony of Irenæus, or any other of any of the fathers, is not so much to be regarded as it speaks their opinion or sense, as it is for that it gives us an evidence of what was then believed, taught, or practised by the church. If he had only signified that he thought fit that infants should be regenerated, it had been but one doctor’s opinion: but he speaks of it as a thing generally known that they were then usually regenerated.

VIII. Near the time that Irenæus wrote these his books against heresies at Lyons in France, and therein uses the word <sup>92.</sup> (A.D. 192.) regeneration for baptism, and speaks of infants as usually regenerated, St. Clement was catechist to the Christian auditors at a very distant place, viz. at Alexandria in Egypt. And he also in all his works commonly uses the phrase of regenerate and regeneration to signify, or connote, the Christian baptism; (as I have largely shewn elsewhere;) which is a plain evidence that it was all over the Christian world at that time (as it has been ever since till of late) the usual way of speaking; and does confirm the argument taken from Irenæus’s words. I shall here recite but one of the places, which is,

*Clem. Alex. Pædagog. lib. i. c. 6. prope ab initio.*

He is here disputing against some heretics (the Valentinians and some other Gnostics) who affrighted the ordinary Christians; telling them, that baptism, as administered by the Catholics, did not put any one into a complete state of Christianity. They said that some of their other rites were necessary. The Valentinians added a great many (of which I mention some, part ii. ch. v.) without which they said baptism in the form mentioned in scripture did not make up a complete redemption (as they styled it), nor was the baptized person τέλειος, perfect, or perfectly initiated. Against whom Clement arguing has there such sayings as these:

Ἀναγεννηθέντες οὖν, εὐθὺς τὸ τέλειον ἀπειλήφαμεν. ‘When we



‘are regenerated [by which he plainly means here *baptized*] we then ‘have received the perfection.’ And a little after, *Αὐτίκα γοῦν βαπτισομένῳ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν ἐπήχησε φωνὴ μάρτυς ἡγαπημένου.* ‘As soon as Christ was baptized, presently the voice came from ‘heaven, declaring him the beloved,’ &c.—Let us then ask these wise men; *Σήμερον ἀναγεννηθεὶς ὁ Χριστὸς ἤδη τέλειός ἐστιν; ἢ ὅπερ ἀποπώτατον, ἐλλιπής;* ‘Was Christ, as soon as he was regenerated, ‘perfect? or will they be so absurd as to say, He still wanted any ‘thing?’ &c. *Ἄμα τοίνυν τῷ βαπτίζεσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου, γίνεται τέλειος.* ‘As soon as baptized by John, he is perfect.’ *Τελειοῦται δὲ τῷ λουτρῷ μόνῳ, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τῇ καθόδῳ ἀγιάζεται.* ‘He is perfected [or perfectly initiated] by the washing [or baptism] alone, and sanctified by the coming of the Holy Spirit on ‘him.’ And a little after he concludes thus: *Ὁ μόνον ἀναγεννηθεὶς, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ τοῦνομα ἔχει, καὶ φωτισθεὶς, ἀπήλλακται μὲν παραχρῆμα,* &c. ‘He that is once regenerated, as the name of that [sacrament] ‘is, and enlightened, has his state immediately changed,’ &c.

Here the words *βαπτίζομενος* and *ἀναγεννηθεὶς*, baptized and regenerated, are all along used promiscuously. And Christ himself is in some of the paragraphs said to be baptized by John, and in some regenerated. And moreover Clement says expressly, the word *regeneration* is the name for baptism: so that though he do not here speak of the case of infants; yet his use of the word, and his declaring it to be the common use, confirms the sense of that saying of Irenæus, which speaks of infants regenerated.

IX. But in another book of the same treatise Clement himself also does so speak, as to suppose and take for granted that the apostles did baptize infants, or little children, *παιδιά*, viz.

*Pædagog. lib. iii. c. 11. prope ab initio.*

He is in this chapter giving direction to Christian men and women concerning the gravity and modesty to be used in their apparel and ornaments. And among other things speaks of the rings then usually worn on their fingers, and the seals engraven on them. He earnestly forbids all idolatrous and lascivious pictures or engravings; and advises to such as are innocent, modest, and useful; and says thus:

‘Let your seal be a dove, or a fish, or a ship under sail, or a harp, ‘as was that of Polycrates, or an anchor, which Seleucus made his ‘choice.’ *Καὶν ἀλιεύων τις ἦ, Ἀποστόλου μεμνήσεται καὶ τῶν ἐξ ὕδατος ἀνασπωμένων παιδίων.* ‘And if any one be by trade a fisherman, he ‘will do well to think of an apostle, and the children taken out of ‘the water.’



I was, since the last edition, advertised of this passage of Clement by two learned men from distant places of England, much about the same time ; the reverend Dr. Jenkins, master of St. John's college, Cambridge, and the reverend Mr. Holland, rector of Sutton in Wiltshire ; as a passage proving infants baptized by the apostles, which I had omitted. I am something ashamed of myself for not having observed it. For though it be expressed in but three words, and therefore might the more easily be overlooked ; yet such transient supposals of a thing, and taking it for granted, are in an ancient author rather plainer proofs of its being then generally used or known, than a larger insisting on it would be.

An apostle's taking, drawing, or lifting a child out of the water, cannot refer to any thing that I can think of, but the baptizing of it. And *infantem de fonte levare*, is a phrase used by the ancients, denoting the baptizing of it, almost as commonly as the word baptizing itself. And as the emblem of an anchor, or of a ship under sail, used for the impress of a seal-ring, does suppose those things to be commonly seen, known, and used ; so St. Clement's advising the emblem of an apostle baptizing an infant to be used by the Christians in his time (which was but about ninety years after the apostles) for the sculpture of their seals, does suppose it commonly known by them that the apostles did perform that office.

I do not find either by any suggestion of the foresaid learned men, or by any search that I have been able to make, that there is in the editions or manuscript copies any variety in the reading of this place ; nor that any commentator has understood it in any other sense. Gentianus Hervetus gives (as Dr. Jenkins has been pleased to inform me) this comment upon it :

‘ Si inculpatur autem in gemma signum piscantis ; Meminerit, inquit, qui gestat annulum, Petri, quem Christus fecit piscatorem hominum ; et puerorum qui baptizati ex aquæ lavacro, seu piscina extrahuntur.’

‘ If there be engraved in a seal-ring the picture of a fisherman, [or rather as Clement's own words are, *if a fisherman will have an engraving on his seal,*] let him think of St. Peter, whom Christ made a fisher of men ; and of the children, which when baptized are drawn out of a laver of water, as out of a fish-pool.’

Whether there be now remaining any memoir of any such emblem as this, used by the Christians in their seals, I know not. But there is proof that in very ancient times they used this very sculpture on their font stones. For there is at Bridekirk in Cum-

berland a font stone<sup>u</sup> so ancient that Camden confesses he could not read the inscription on it, nor guess what was meant by several little images which were as he says, 'curiously engraven on it.' But the present bishop of Derry, Dr. Nicholson, late bishop of Carlisle, has both explained the inscription; and by the imagery, he says, there is 'fairly represented a person in a long sacerdotal habit, dipping a child into the water; and a dove, the emblem no doubt of the Holy Ghost, hovering over the infant,' &c. This I took notice of in my former editions, part ii. ch. ii. § xiv.

But I did not then know that St. Clement had advised such a sculpture for seals.

## CHAP. IV.

### *Out of Tertullian.*

§ I. TERTULLIAN and Origen being the two next that have  
100. said any thing of this matter, their character is such as  
(A.D. 200.) requires something to be said of it. They were both of them very learned men; but both inclined to be singular in their opinions, and accordingly both fell into great and monstrous errors in the faith.

The first fell into the heresy of the Montanists, who blasphemously held that one Montanus was that paraclete or comforter which our Saviour promised to send: and that better and fuller discoveries of God's will were made to him than to the apostles, who prophesied only in part. He commonly calls the catholics *psychicos*, 'the carnal men.' And he afterward forsook the Montanists too, and set up a new sect of his own called *Tertullianists*<sup>x</sup>: some remainders of which sect continued at Carthage till St. Austin's time, and he had the happiness to convert the last of them, and to get them to give up their church or place of worship to the catholics.

The other being a great Platonist, taught the preexistence of souls: that the souls of all men had a former being before the world, and had sinned in that former state, and were sent hither into bodies as a punishment: and he derived original sin from thence, which the scripture derives from the fall of Adam<sup>y</sup>. He had also other errors about the resurrection and the future state, &c.,

<sup>u</sup> [For more full accounts and engravings of this font, see Philosophical Transactions for 1685, No. 178; Camden's Britannia by Gibson, and especially by Gough, vol. iii. p. 183; Nicholson's His-

tory of Westmoreland and Cumberland, 4to. vol. ii. p. 101; Archæologia, vol. ii. p. 131; and vol. xiv. p. 113.]

<sup>x</sup> Augustin. de Hæresibus, c. 26, et 86.

<sup>y</sup> Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xi. c. 23.

so that St. Hierome giving advice to Tranquilinus<sup>2</sup> of the caution wherewith one must read Origen's works, says, 'My opinion is, that Origen is sometimes to be read because of his learning, but so as we read Tertullian, Arnobius, Apollinaris, and some other ecclesiastical writers, both Greek and Latin, taking care to choose the good that is in them, and avoid the contrary.'

As for the occasion I have here to quote them, the rule I mentioned before is chiefly to be minded; that so far as they do, as historians, give us an account of the faith and practice of the church in their times, their testimony is considerable: but where either of them has any particular opinion of his own, it is not of any great authority.

Tertullian has spoke so in this matter of infant-baptism, as that it is hard to reconcile the several passages with one another. The reader shall have the particulars.

*Tertullianus de Baptismo, c. 10.*

II. Having spoken of the matter of baptism, water, and the form of it, *In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, he adds,

'Diximus, quantum mediocritati nostræ licuit, de universis, quæ baptismi religionem struunt: nunc ad reliquum statum ejus æque, ut potero, progrediar de quæstiunculis quibusdam.'

'I have, according to my mean ability, discoursed of all things that make up the religion [or essence] of baptism: now I will proceed to speak of some lesser questions about the other state thereof.'

Afterward, c. 12, 13.

III. 'Quum vero præscribitur nemini sine baptismo competere salutem, ex illa maxime pronunciatione Domini, qui ait; *Nisi natus ex aqua quis erit, non habet vitam*: suboriuntur scrupulosi, imo temerarii retractatus quorundam, quomodo ex ista præscriptione apostolis salus competat, quos tinctos non invenimus in Domino, præter Paulum: imo cum Paulus solus ex illis baptismum Christi induerit, aut præjudicatum esse de cæterorum periculo, qui careant aqua Christi, ut præscriptio salva sit: aut rescindi præscriptionem, si etiam non tinctis salus statuta est. Audiavi (Domino teste) ejusmodi: ne quis me tam perditum existimet, ut ultro exagitem libidine styli quæ aliis scrupulum ineutiant. Et nunc illis, ut potero, respondebo qui negant apostolos tinctos. Nam si humanum Johannis baptismum inierant et Dominicum desiderabant (quatenus unum baptismum definierat ipse Dominus, dicens Petro perfundi volenti; *Qui semel lavit non habet necesse*

<sup>2</sup> Ep. ad Tranquilinum, 76.

‘*rursum* : quod utique non tincto omnino non dixisset) et hæc est probatio exerta adversus illos qui adimunt apostolis etiam Johannis baptismum, ut destruant aquæ sacramentum.’ Paulo post, ‘Hic ergo scelestissimi illi provocant quæstiones : adeo dicunt, Baptismus non est necessarius, quibus fides satis est : nam et Abraham nullius aquæ nisi fidei sacramento Deo placuit.

‘Sed in omnibus posteriora concludunt, et sequentia antecedentibus prævalent. Fuerit salus retro per fidem nudam ante Domini passionem, et resurrectionem : at ubi fides aucta est credendi in nativitatem, passionem, resurrectionemque ejus ; addita est ampliatio sacramento, obsignatio baptismi, vestimentum quodammodo fidei, quæ retro erat nuda, nec potest jam [esse] sine sua lege. Lex enim tinguendi imposita est et forma præscripta ; *Ite*, inquit, *docete nationes, tingentes eas in nomen Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*. Huic legi collata definitio illa, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non intrabit in regnum cælorum* ; obstrinxit fidem ad baptismi necessitatem. Itaque omnes exinde credentes tinguuntur,’ &c.

‘Whereas it is an acknowledged rule, that none can be saved without baptism, grounded especially on that sentence of our Lord, *Unless one be born of water he cannot be saved* : some scruples do arise, and even rash discourses of some men, how according to that rule the apostles could be saved, whom we do not find to have been baptized with our Lord’s baptism, except Paul. And when Paul only of them had the baptism of Christ, either the rest, who wanted this water of Christ, must be supposed in a dangerous condition, that so the rule may stand-fast ; or else the rule is broken, if any persons not baptized, can be saved. I have heard some men (God is my witness) talk at this rate, and would have nobody think me so lewd as by the itch of my pen to raise questions purposely, which may cause scruples in other men.

‘I will here give an answer, as well as I can, to those men that deny the apostles to have been baptized. For if they received only the baptism of John as of a man, and had not that of our Lord, (inasmuch as our Lord himself had determined that there is to be but one baptism, saying to Peter when he desired to be washed, *He that has been once washed, has no need again* : which he would not have said to one that had not been washed at all,) even this is a plain proof against those who take away from the apostles even the baptism of John, that they may abolish as needless the sacrament of water.’—And a little after—‘Here again these impious men raise cavils, and say, Baptism is not necessary for those



‘ that have faith, which is sufficient; for Abraham without any sacrament of water, but of faith only, pleased God.

‘ But in all matters the later injunctions bind, and the following rules take place above those that were before. Though there were salvation formerly by bare faith before our Lord’s passion and resurrection; yet when the faith is enlarged to believe in his nativity, passion, and resurrection, there is an enlargement of the sacrament, the sealing of baptism, as it were a garment to our faith; which formerly was bare, but cannot now be without its law: for the law of baptizing is given, and the form of it appointed; *Go, says he, teach the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* And when to this law that rule is added, *Except one be regenerated of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven*, it has bound up faith to a necessity of baptism. And therefore all believers from thenceforward were baptized,’ &c.

And afterward, c. 17.

IV. Having said that it is not absolutely unlawful for laymen to baptize, he adds:

‘ Sed quanto magis laicis disciplina verecundiæ et modestiæ incumbit; cum ea majoribus competant, ne sibi adsumant dicatum episcopis officium episcopatus? *Æmulatio schismatum mater est. Omnia licere, dixit sanctissimus apostolus, sed non omnia expedire.* Sufficiat scilicet in necessitatibus utaris, sicubi aut loci aut temporis aut personæ conditio compellit. Tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur, cum urget circumstantia periclitantis. Quoniam reus erit perditioni hominis, si supersederit præstare quod libere potuit.’

‘ But how much more necessary for laymen is it to keep the rules of humility and modesty; that since these things belong to men of higher order, they do not arrogate to themselves the office of the bishops that is proper to them? Emulation is the mother of schism. The most blessed apostle said, that *all things were lawful, but all things were not expedient.* Let it suffice that thou make use of this power in cases of necessity: when the circumstance either of the place, or of the time, or of the person requires it. For then the adventuring to help is well taken, when the condition of a person in danger forces one to it: because he that shall neglect at such a time to do what he lawfully may, will be guilty of the person’s perdition [or damnation.]’

Let the reader mind how all this is to be reconciled with what he says afterwards, c. 18.

V. ‘Cæterum baptismum non temere credendum esse sciant quorum officium est. *Omni petenti te dato, suum habet titulum, proinde ad eleemosynam pertinentem. Imo illud potius perspicuum; Nolite dare sanctum canibus, et porcis projicere margarita vestra: et, Manus ne facile imposueris, ne participes aliena delicta. . . .* Itaque pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est: præcipue tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est [ ] sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventu malæ indolis falli. Ait quidem Dominus, *Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire.* Veniant ergo dum adulescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur: fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautius agetur in secularibus; ut cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Norint petere salutem, ut petenti dedisse videaris. Non minori de causa innupti quoque procrastinandi, in quibus tentatio præparata est; tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant aut continentiae corroborentur. Si quipondus intelligant baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem quam dilationem. Fides integra secura est de salute.

‘Diem baptismo solemniozem Pascha præstat; cum et passio Domini in quam tingimur, adimpleta est,’ &c.

‘But they whose duty it is to administer baptism, are to know that it must not be given rashly. *Give to every one that asketh thee*, has its proper subject, and relates to almsgiving: but that command rather is here to be considered, *Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine*; and that, *Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men’s faults. . . .* Therefore according to every one’s condition and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more profitable, especially in the case of little children. For what need is there [ ] that the godfathers should be brought into danger? because they may either fail of their promises by death, or they may be mistaken by a child’s proving of wicked disposition. Our Lord says indeed, *Do not forbid them to come to me.* Therefore let them come when they are grown up; let them come when they understand; when they are instructed whither it is that they come; let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. What need their guiltless age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins? Men will proceed more warily in worldly things; and he that should not have earthly goods committed to him, yet shall have heavenly.

‘ Let them know how to desire this salvation, that you may appear  
‘ to have given to one that asketh.

‘ For no less reason unmarried persons ought to be kept off, who  
‘ are likely to come into tentation, as well those that never were  
‘ married, upon account of their coming to ripeness, as those in  
‘ widowhood for the miss of their partner: until they either marry  
‘ or be confirmed in continence. They that understand the weight  
‘ of baptism will rather dread the receiving it than the delaying of  
‘ it. An entire faith is secure of salvation.

‘ The most solemn time for baptism is Easter, at which time the  
‘ passion of our Lord, into which we are baptized, was fulfilled,’ &c.

Let there be also compared with this, what he says in another book.

*Tertullianus de Anima*, c. 39, 40.

VI. ‘ Adeo nulla ferme nativitas munda est, utique ethnicorum.  
‘ Hinc enim et apostolus ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos pro-  
‘ creari ait: tam ex seminis prærogativa, quam ex institutionis dis-  
‘ ciplina: cæterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur. Quasi designatos  
‘ tamen sanctitati, ac per hoc etiam saluti intelligi volens fidelium  
‘ filios: ut hujus spei pignore matrimonii quæ retinenda censuerat  
‘ patrocineretur. Alioquin meminerat Dominicæ definitionis, *Nisi*  
‘ *quis nascetur ex aqua et Spiritu, non ibit in regnum Dei*, i. e. non erit  
‘ sanctus. Ita omnis anima eousque in Adam censetur, donec in  
‘ Christo recenseatur; tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recenseatur:  
‘ peccatrix autem, quia immunda.’

‘ So there is almost no being born clean, [or free from sin,] that  
‘ is of heathens. For hence the apostle says, that of either parent  
‘ sanctified, the children that are born are holy, by reason of the  
‘ prerogative of that seed, and also the instruction in their educa-  
‘ tion. Else, says he, were they unclean. But yet meaning to be  
‘ understood thus: that the children of the faithful are designed for  
‘ holiness, and so for salvation; that by a pledge of such hope he  
‘ might plead for those marriages which he would have to be con-  
‘ tinued. Otherwise [or, as for any other meaning] he knew well  
‘ enough what our Lord had determined, *Except one be born of water*  
‘ *and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God*, that is,  
‘ he shall not be holy. Thus every soul is reckoned as in Adam, so  
‘ long till it be anew enrolled in Christ, and so long unclean, till it  
‘ be so enrolled, and sinful because unclean,’ &c.

VII. I have cited these passages at large and all together, that  
the reader may try if he can pick any coherent sense out of them.  
It is the property of warm men, when they are speaking earnestly



on one subject and urging that, to overlash so, as that when they are speaking on another with like earnestness, they fall into contradiction of what they said before. This author in the places here first cited, treating of the necessity of baptism, speaks of that necessity as absolute; and of those that die unbaptized, as lost men: and is enraged at those that maintain that faith without it is sufficient to salvation. Yet afterward, when he is discoursing of the *weight*, as he calls it, of baptism, he advises several sorts of people to delay it; and to encourage them, tells them that if they should by that delay happen to miss of it, 'an entire faith is secure of 'salvation.'

The most probable guess that I can make of that which was his steady meaning (if he had any) is, that those who put off their baptism negligently, or as slighting it, do, if they finally die without it, lose their life: but that in those that put it off only that they may be fitter for it, and in a more likely condition to keep it unstained, if by that means they happen to die without it, the will and purpose of being baptized shall be accepted for the deed.

And when he is discoursing on the aforesaid subject of the weight of baptism, he finds fault with the custom of baptizing infants, and would have them delayed till they are able to understand and consider what they do, and then further till they are married; and if they do not marry, or if their consort die, then further till the danger of lust is over, which is frequently not till old age. A strange advice, and which no men, either of the ancients or moderns, either of the one or the other side in this controversy, do approve of. And to urge his opinion the more, he speaks of infants as if they were innocent or sinless, and so had no need of the forgiveness of sins granted in this sacrament.

Yet in the last cited place, when he is on another theme, he plainly owns the catholic doctrine of original sin in infants; and that every soul born of Adam is unclean and sinful, and continues so till it be enrolled or ranked anew in Christ: and cites, as pertinent to their case, the prescription, as he calls it, or the standing rule, John iii. 5, *Except any one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into God's kingdom.*

How to reconcile this diversity, I know not, unless his meaning (when he would have spoken for good) were, that the baptism of infants, and of those other sorts of persons, should be delayed till the times he speaks of, in case there were no danger of death in the mean while; but that in case of such danger it should be administered presently: in which case he says it is so necessary, that any



one that is present (whether in orders or not, so he determines it) ought to administer it, or else he is guilty of the person's ruin or perdition.

VIII. And I like this my resolution of his opinion the better, because I find it to be what several of each of the disagreeing parties do agree to have been his sense. For as Mr. Baxter<sup>a</sup> makes this acknowledgment, 'Yet again I will confess, that the words of Tertullian and Nazianzen shew, that it was long before all were agreed of the very time, or of the necessity of baptizing infants, before any use of reason, in case they were like to live to maturity.' So Mr. Danvers<sup>b</sup> his antagonist owns this, 'Tertullian, that, as Dr. Barlow tells us, was so great an opposer of infant baptism, as irrational and unwarrantable, yet had this fancy of baptizing a dying child to save it.' Somebody or other had so strangely imposed upon this man, that he thought the modern pædobaptists were ashamed to own this doctrine, that a child or other person is to be baptized that he may be saved. Also Mr. Tombes says<sup>c</sup>, 'If he [Tertullian] did allow it, it was only in case of necessity, as may appear by his words in his book *de Anima*, c. 39.' And to name one of the church of Rome, Vasquez says, that 'those places in the book *de Anima*, and those where he makes baptism necessary to salvation, do not prove that he recanted his opinion<sup>d</sup>, for he might well enough assert that baptism is necessary for all, and yet think that it was not to be given before adult age in any other case but only that of extreme necessity.'

This explication of his meaning is also confirmed from the older editions of this book, *de Baptismo*, which instead of those words in Rigaltius's edition, '*Quid enim necesse est sponsores,*' &c. 'What need is there that godfathers,' &c. read thus: '*Quid enim necesse est, si non tam necesse, sponsores,*' &c. 'What occasion is there, except in case of necessity, that the godfathers,' &c. So it is in the edition of Pamelius: and so, as Pamelius affirms, Gaigneus the first editor of this book, *de Baptismo*, has it. But I have followed the edition which I had, which is Rigaltius's, (only leaving a blank at the place,) supposing he had some ground from the manuscripts to leave out that clause. Yet it cannot be denied that he has (as

<sup>a</sup> More Proofs of Infants' Church-membership and consequently their right to Baptism; in three parts. Pt. ii. ch. 4. § 59. 8vo. Lond. 1675.

<sup>b</sup> First Answer to Wills, p. 9. 8vo. Lond. 1675.

<sup>c</sup> Examen of Marshal's Sermon, [forming part of his two Treatises concerning Infant Baptism, 4to. 1645.] p. 10.

<sup>d</sup> Gabriel Vasquez, *Commentaria in tertiam partem Thomæ*, fol. 1610. &c. tom. ii. disp. 154. c. 1.

Mr. le Clerc<sup>e</sup> observes) set some passages false, that were true in the former editions; nor that he has otherwise shewn himself partial for the antipædobaptists, as I shall shew hereafter, pt. ii. ch. xi. § 5. And therefore I incline now to the opinion, that the old editions are the truest, and that it ought to be read, ‘except in case of necessity.’ And then the case is plain how his meaning was.

IX. But that which most deserves the reader’s observation is, that the words of Tertullian do not import that the custom of the Christians at that time was to leave infants unbaptized: but on the contrary, they plainly intimate that there was a custom of baptizing them: only he dislikes that that custom should be generally used. For when he says, ‘Why does that innocent age make such haste,’ &c. his words shew the matter of fact to have been so, together with his opinion against it. But the thing we now inquire of, is the practice of the church, and not one doctor’s opinion, especially when it does not appear that any body was prevailed on by him to alter that practice; for there is no appearance that either the Montanists (to whom he turned) or the Tertullianists (whom he set up) were against it. On the contrary, St. Austin<sup>f</sup> reciting the opinions of both these sects, does not mention any such thing held by either of them, and says at other places, that he never read of any sect that did deny it, as I shew hereafter.

The same observation ought to be made concerning the sponsors or godfathers, whom he speaks of as used in the baptism of infants that could not answer for themselves. Which shews the great mistake of some of the more ignorant persons among the antipædobaptists, who derive the use of godfathers from I know not what pope of Rome of late years; whereas this was within a 100 years of the apostles.

X. It is a heedless answer that he makes to those words of our Saviour, *Suffer little children to come to me, &c.*, when he says, ‘Let them come when they are grown up, when they understand,’ &c. For that seems to be the very thing that the disciples said, when they rebuked those that brought them, for which rebuke our Saviour blamed the disciples. It is something a better answer which the antipædobaptists nowadays give, viz. that our Saviour would indeed have infants brought to him in their infancy, and before they understood, and that he blessed them, &c. but we do not read that he baptized them. To which the other reply, that he declared the love

<sup>e</sup> Quæstiones Hieronymianæ. Q. ix. c. 3. 8vo. 1701.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. de Hæresibus, c. 26. 86.

of God to them, by his blessing and embracing, and saying, *Of such is the kingdom of God*. Which shews them to be capable of the covenant of mercy, and that infants are expressly admitted to enter covenant, Deut. xxix. 10, *you, your little ones, &c.*, and in the Old Testament had the seal of the covenant. From whence it will follow that it is no absurdity by reason of their nonage; which is the only thing Tertullian argues from. And besides, when our Saviour says, *Of such is the kingdom of God*; (which shews them to be capable of his kingdom,) and thereupon orders them to be *brought to him*, and says, *forbid* [or withhold] *them not*: since he is now present with us only in his ordinances and sacraments, what way have we to bring our children to him, as he orders, but by baptism to offer and dedicate them to him?

XI. In the same book of baptism, c. 5, he observes that the heathen nations also used baptism as a religious rite, and particularly in the Mysteries of Apollo and Ceres, persons were baptized, ‘*Idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem perjuriorum suorum agere præsumunt.*’ ‘And they say, they do this for their regeneration and the pardon of their former perjuries.’ And he says, ‘Here we see the aim of the Devil imitating the things of God.’ He means, the heathens imitated the Jewish baptism.

XII. One thing more ought to be observed out of the passage I cited from Tertullian’s book, *de Anima*, viz. that he expounds that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy*, much after the same rate as many modern pædobaptists do of baptismal holiness: only he thinks the apostle speaks of it, not as then given, but as designed for them. He paraphrases, *sancti*, ‘holy,’ by *sanctitati designati*, ‘designed for holiness,’ (viz. when they come to be baptized, as his following words in the said passage shew, if the reader will turn back to them.) This sense of a baptismal holiness the antipædobaptists (who understand no more by it but that such children are not bastards) would condemn as a new exposition: but I shall shew by more instances that will come in my way, and especially in ch. xix. § 19, where I compare together all the expositions of this text given by the ancients, that it was the most general one.

XIII. It is plain that St. Austin, and Pelagius, and several others that managed the Pelagian controversy, had never seen Tertullian’s book of baptism. For when St. Austin pleaded that no Christian, catholic or sectary, had ever taught to the contrary, but that one



reason for the baptizing of infants was for the forgiveness of original sin; Pelagius granted<sup>h</sup> that there was none that denied that they were to be baptized: but when he, and Celestius, and Julian, do ransack antiquity for places to shew that they are baptized on other accounts, and not for forgiveness; how neatly would that saying of Tertullian have fitted them, ‘What need their innocent [or sinless] age make such haste for the forgiveness of sin?’ Or else we must say, they would not quote it, because he contradicts himself in this point. Or else they would not use his authority, which was in no good repute, because he revolted to heresy: though Dr. Allix<sup>i</sup> concludes this book to have been written before.

It was customary in those times, if any one made use of Tertullian’s authority in any controverted matter, to stop his mouth with that saying of St. Hierome<sup>k</sup>, ‘*Illum hominem ecclesiæ non fuisse,*’ ‘that Tertullian was not a man of the church;’ and Pelagius had a great mind (if it had been possible for him, continuing in his opinion of denying original sin) to have continued a member of the catholic church.

Baronius likewise observes, that when the Donatists maintained against St. Austin and the catholics, that baptism given by heretics is null, and the party must be baptized again; if St. Austin could have shewn, that this opinion was first set on foot by Tertullian, (whose name was in ill repute for his singular opinions,) that that one thing would have served much to discredit it. And that he might have done, if he had ever seen this book of baptism, where that opinion is asserted, c. 15, which is the earliest mention we find of it.

Yet St. Hierome had seen this book either in Greek or Latin, (in both which languages it was written,) for he quotes some passages out of it about the story of St. Paul and Tecla, but nothing about the matter of infants.

## CHAP. V.

*Quotations out of Origen.*

*Homilia 8. in Levit. c. 4.*

§ I. ‘AUDI David dicentem; *In iniquitatibus*, inquit, *conceptus*  
110. ‘*sum, et in peccatis peperit me mater mea: ostendens,*  
(A. D. 210.) ‘*quod quæcunque anima in carne nascitur, iniquitatis et*

<sup>h</sup> See ch. 19. § 30.

<sup>i</sup> [See ‘*Dissertatio de Tertulliani vita et scriptis,*’ (an octavo tract of 88 pages, without date, place, or author’s name, but

written by Dr. P. Allix, and printed at Paris in 1680,) ch. 4. p. 28.]

<sup>k</sup> Adv. Helvidium.



‘peccati sorde polluitur: et propterea dictum esse illud, quod jam  
 ‘superius memoravimus; *quia nemo mundus a sorde, nec si unius diei  
 ‘sit vita ejus.* Addi his etiam illud potest, ut requiratur, quid causæ sit,  
 ‘cum baptisma ecclesiæ pro remissione peccatorum detur, secundum  
 ‘ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari: cum utique  
 ‘si nihil esset in parvulis, quod ad remissionem deberet, et indul-  
 ‘gentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur.’

‘Hear David speaking, *I was*, says he, *conceived in iniquity, and  
 ‘in sin did my mother bring me forth*: shewing that every soul that  
 ‘is born in the flesh is polluted with the filth of sin and iniquity:  
 ‘and that therefore that was said which we mentioned before; that  
 ‘*none is clean from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one  
 ‘day.*

‘Besides all this, let it be considered, what is the reason that  
 ‘whereas the baptism of the church is given for forgiveness of  
 ‘sins, infants also are by the usage of the church baptized: when  
 ‘if there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy,  
 ‘the grace of baptism would be needless to them.’

*Homil. in Lucam 14.*

II. ‘Quod frequenter inter fratres quæritur, loci occasione com-  
 ‘mota [l. commotus] retracto. Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem  
 ‘peccatorum. Quorum peccatorum? Vel quo tempore peccaverunt?  
 ‘Aut quomodo potest ulla lavaeri in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi  
 ‘juxta illum sensum de quo paulo ante diximus; nullus mundus a  
 ‘sorde, nec si unius diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram? Et  
 ‘quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur,  
 ‘propterea baptizantur et parvuli.’

‘Having occasion given in this place, I will mention a thing that  
 ‘causes frequent inquiries among the brethren. Infants are baptized  
 ‘for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins? Or when have they  
 ‘sinned? Or how can any reason of the laver in their case hold  
 ‘good, but according to that sense that we mentioned even now:  
 ‘none is free from pollution, though his life be but of the length of  
 ‘one day upon the earth? And it is for that reason because by the  
 ‘sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away, that  
 ‘infants are baptized.’

*Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos, lib. v. c. 9.*

III. ‘Denique et in lege pro parvulo, qui natus fuerit, jubetur  
 ‘offerri hostia, *par turturum, aut duo pulli columbini: ex quibus unus  
 ‘pro peccato, et alius in holocaustum.* Pro quo peccato offertur hic  
 ‘pullus unus? Nunquid nuper editus parvulus peccare jam potuit?  
 ‘Ettamen habet peccatum, pro quo hostia jubetur offerri, a quo mundus

‘negatur quis esse, nec si unius diei fuerit vita ejus. De hoc ergo etiam David dixisse credendus est illud quod supra memoravimus, *Quia in peccato concepit me mater mea*: secundum historiam enim nullum matris ejus declaratur peccatum. Pro hoc et ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quod essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam et Spiritum ablui deberent: propter quas etiam corpus ipsum, corpus peccati, nominatur.’

‘And also in the law it is commanded, that a sacrifice be offered for every child that is born, a *pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons*: of which one is for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering<sup>1</sup>. For what sin is this one pigeon offered? Can the child that is new born have committed any sin? It has even then sin, for which the sacrifice is commanded to be offered; from which even he whose life is but of one day is denied to be free. Of this sin David is to be supposed to have said that which we mentioned before, *In sin did my mother conceive me*: for there is in the history no account of any particular sin that his mother had committed.

‘For this also it was, that the church had from the apostles a tradition [or order] to give baptism even to infants. For they, to whom the divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit: by reason of which the body itself is also called the body of sin.’

IV. The plainness of these testimonies is such as needs nothing to be said of it, nor admits any thing to be said against it. They do not only suppose the practice to be generally known and used, but also mention its being ordered by the apostles.

But concerning the authenticalness of them there does need something to be said. For the Greek (which is the original) of all Origen’s works being lost, except a very few, there remains only the Latin translations of them. And when these translations were collected together, a great many spurious ones were added and mixed with them, and went under Origen’s name. But upon the renewal of learning, the critics quickly smelt them out, and admitted none for his, but such as appeared to have been done into Latin either by St. Hierome or else by Rufinus: both of whom lived within the time limited for our present inquiry, viz. the first 400 years.

For which reason I have rejected the quotations brought by some

<sup>1</sup> Levit. xii. 8.

for infant baptism out of Origen on Job, which is plainly a spurious piece written by some Arian.

V. Of these which I have brought, the Homilies on St. Luke were translated by St. Hierome; but those on Leviticus and the Comments on the Epistle to the Romans, by Rufinus. St. Hierome added a preface to his translation, which is printed with it; a passage out of which is quoted by Rufinus<sup>m</sup>, and also some part of the translation itself. And St. Hierome himself mentions this work in the catalogue of his own works<sup>n</sup>. So that of this there is no doubt. Erasmus once doubted whether even these homilies were the genuine works of Origen, as Huetius observes in these words<sup>o</sup>: ‘ Erasmus in his Epistle to Francis Ciglianus, had written that these Homilies did seem to be some other man’s and not Origen’s: but in his Censure affixed to the books of Origen, he recanted his opinion, and acknowledged the true author.’ Which I the rather note, because Mr. Tombes<sup>p</sup> and Mr. Danvers<sup>q</sup> do quote Erasmus on Luke i. 3, saying thus: ‘ For so he seems to think, whoever he was, whose Commentaries are extant upon Luke, under the title of Adamantius, [or Origen.] From whence they conclude that Erasmus took them not to be Origen’s, or at least doubted of it.’ Which is not fair, if they knew that Erasmus had recanted his doubt, as is to be seen in his edition of Origen’s works.

VI. Neither does any one raise any question of the translation of the other two, on Leviticus and the Romans, but that it was done by Rufinus. But these two men used several methods in translating. For, whereas Origen’s books contained in them several expressions not consistent with the faith in some points; St. Hierome<sup>r</sup> changed nothing, but expressed every thing as it was in the original, as he owns himself: but Rufinus altered or left out any thing that he thought not orthodox. And in the Homilies on Leviticus he himself says, that he took a greater liberty than ordinary.

All the world since have approved the method of St. Hierome, and blamed that of Rufinus: for it is fit for a translator to give a true account of what his author says, be it good or bad. Whereas now in these translations of Rufinus, the reader is uncertain (as Erasmus angrily says) whether he read Origen or Rufinus.

Some antipædobaptists do for this reason reject the quotations here brought out of the Homilies on Leviticus and the Romans: it

<sup>m</sup> Apolog. adv. Hieronym. secunda.

<sup>n</sup> De Scriptoribus Ecl.

<sup>o</sup> Origenianorum, lib. iii. p. 253. edit. Rothomagi, 1668.

<sup>p</sup> Third Review, or third part of Anti-

pædobaptism, 4to. 1657.

<sup>q</sup> First Reply to Mr. Wills, p. 87.

<sup>r</sup> Vide Erasmus in Censura operum Origenis.

being uncertain whether they are the words of the author, or the additions or interpolations of the translator. This plea must needs give some abatement to the authority of these two testimonies: yet it is the less in this matter, because,

1. That on St. Luke, translated by St. Hierome, contains the same thing in effect: it is as full an evidence of the then practice, only it does not mention the tradition from the apostles.

2. There is no kind of probability that Rufinus (whatever interpolations he might make in other matters) made any alteration in this; since this was none of the subjects on which Origen's opinion was questioned by the church in Rufinus's time. Those things in which he was singular, are largely canvassed both by St. Hierome and Rufinus themselves in their invectives and apologies one against another: and also by Epiphanius<sup>s</sup>, and Theophilus<sup>t</sup>, bishop of Alexandria, who reckons thirty-five singular opinions that Origen held: and they are about the resurrection of the same body, the eternity of hell torments, the preexistence of souls, some expressions about the Trinity, &c., but not one word about this matter. And there is no pretence that Rufinus had any other occasion to alter any thing, but only as being a great lover of Origen, whatever was in his comments expressed in a doubtful or heterodox sense concerning any of the aforesaid points, he left it out, or else gave it a favourable turn in the translation, or in some explication that he added. But what is this to the baptism of infants, concerning which it is not pretended that Origen's enemies challenged him as holding any singular opinion?

3. Rufinus (who confesses that in the translation of the Comments on Leviticus he had used more freedom) says only this of his management in the Translation of the Comments on the Epistle to the Romans, that he had 'shortened this work by one half<sup>u</sup>.' He speaks of no addition to that; and it is in that that there is mention of the tradition from apostles.

VII. Mr. Tombes says<sup>x</sup>, that 'if one read these passages, and 'consider how they are brought in, and how plain the expressions 'are against the Pelagians, one shall conceive that they were put in 'after the Pelagian heresy was confuted by Hierome and Austin, 'who often tells us that the fathers, afore that controversy arose, did 'not speak plainly against the Pelagians. And of all others Origen 'is most taxed as pelagianizing.'

<sup>s</sup> Epist. ad Joannem Hierosolymit.

<sup>t</sup> Epistolæ Paschales, B. P. tom. iv.  
[scil. Bibl. Patrum Max. Colon. 1618-22.]

<sup>u</sup> Præfat. in Epist. ad Romanos.

<sup>x</sup> Examen, p. 7.



If the passages did speak of, or relate to any contest about the doctrine of original sin, or any adversaries to it; or did set themselves to prove it as a thing controverted: this exception would have some weight. But they speak of it as a supposed and known thing from scripture, and as of a thing denied by none, and in no other style than many sayings of other fathers do before Pelagius's time, some of which I cited out of Irenæus<sup>y</sup>. And the opinion in which Origen pelagianized, was not, as Mr. Tombes would intimate, in denying that corrupt state in which all are born into this world, (his asserting of that in many other places is notorious, and he built his opinion of preexistence on it,) but in affirming that it is possible for a man in this life to arrive at such a perfect conquest of the said corruption, that he may afterward live without sin: which was another of the false doctrines of Pelagius. This is plainly proved to have been the opinion of Origen, from the few words of St. Hierome in the Prologue to his Dialogues against the Pelagians; where, having recited the opinions of some former heretics that vaunted themselves to be without sin, he adds, 'Illud autem Origenis proprium est,' &c. 'But Origen had this peculiar opinion, that it is impossible for a human soul to be without sin from its beginning to its death: and on the other side, that it is possible, when a man turns himself to a good life, to arrive to such strength, that afterwards he shall not sin.' It was on account of this tenet that St. Hierome calls Origen 'the Pelagians' beloved<sup>z</sup>.' Which he does at the latter end of the last of the dialogues above-mentioned. Mr. Tombes might easily have observed in those few works of Origen, that are left in the original, as plain expressions against the Pelagians (as he calls it, i. e. as plain mentions of original sin) as there are in these passages. As in his seventh book against Celsus, (§ 50.) p. 365. ed. Cant. 1658, he discourses much as he does here, how the books of the Old Testament do order a sin offering to be offered, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄρτι γεγεννημένων, ὡς οὐ καθαρῶν ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας: 'even for infants new born, as being not clear from sin.' Where he proceeds, on the same argument, to quote, as he does here, the saying of David, Psalm li. 5, and several such texts.

VIII. But this argument of Mr. Tombes may be well retorted against those that think these passages were put in by Rufinus. (Mr. Tombes in one part of his discourse seems to lay it on him, and yet in another, seems to think they were put in by somebody afterward: or else he speaks absurdly when he makes it to be done after

<sup>y</sup> Ch. 3. § 1.

<sup>z</sup> ['Amasium vestrum.' See Hierom. opera, tom. ii. p. 792. edit. Vallarsii.]

the Pelagian times.) For whoever had put in any thing of original sin, Rufinus would not: he had been more likely to rase it out, if he had not been afraid of censure. For though he seems to have concealed his opinion from the world, except some few confidants, it was proved after his death, that he was an enemy to the doctrine of original sin, at least as derived from our first parents. St. Hierome does once or twice reckon him by the name of Grunnius<sup>a</sup> among the precursors, or those that had given occasion to Pelagius. He himself tells how some had accused him to Anastasius bishop of Rome, as having unsound opinions about the origin of the soul: and he makes but a lame answer to it, in the letter which he writes to him for his apology. But Celestius discovered all, when being upon his trial at a council of Carthage, (in which he was condemned for this heresy,) there were these examinations and answers, which St. Austin has quoted out of the Acts of that Council<sup>b</sup>, which was held anno Dom. 412.

‘ The bishop Aurelius said, Let the rest [of the articles charged  
‘ on him] be read.

‘ And there was read, That the sin of Adam hurt himself only, and  
‘ not mankind.

‘ Celestius answered, I said, that I was unresolved concerning the  
‘ derivation of sin, (yet so as to submit to any one to whom God has  
‘ given the grace of knowledge,) because I have heard different  
‘ opinions of this from those that have been presbyters of the ca-  
‘ tholic church.

‘ Paulinus the deacon said, Tell us their names.

‘ Celestius said, The holy Presbyter Rufinus, who dwelt at Rome  
‘ with holy Pammachius; I have heard him say, that there is no  
‘ derivation of sin.

‘ Paulinus the deacon said, Are there any more?

‘ Celestius said, I have heard others also say the same.

‘ Paulinus the deacon said, Tell us their names?

‘ Celestius said, Is not one presbyter enough for you?

And afterward, in another place [of the Acts].

‘ Aurelius the bishop said, Let the rest of the charge be read.

‘ And there was read, That infants when they are born are in  
‘ the same state that Adam was in before his transgression.

‘ Aurelius the bishop said, Did you ever teach so, Celestius, that  
‘ infants, &c.?

<sup>a</sup> Ep. ad Ctesiphontem; item, Præfat. lib. iv. in Jeremiam.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. de Peccato Originali, c. 34.

‘ Celestius said, Let him explain how he means ; before his transgression, &c.

‘ Aurelius the bishop said, Whether the state of infants now to be baptized, be such as Adam’s was before his transgression : or whether they do derive the guilt of transgression from the same sinful origin from whence they are born ? This is what the deacon Paulinus would hear from you.

‘ Paulinus the deacon said, Whether he has taught that or not, let him deny.

‘ Celestius said, I told you before concerning the derivation of sin, that I have heard several in the catholic church deny it : and some I have heard affirm it. It is a matter of question [or controversy] not of heresy. As for infants, I always said, that they stand in need of baptism, and that they ought to be baptized,’ &c.

We see that though Celestius pretended he could have named others, yet he named none but Rufinus, who was dead, as holding this tenet. Rufinus therefore was not likely to insert any thing into Origen’s works about original sin.

I know that Garnier the Jesuit would have it<sup>b</sup>, that the Rufinus intended by Celestius was another of the same name, and not he whose works we have ; and that, because Mercator calls him a Syrian ; whereas this Rufinus whose works we have, was of Aquileia. But others with more reason think, that Mercator calls him a Syrian only because he lived thirty years in Syria and those eastern parts, and brought his errors and his love of Origen from thence. And the Rufinus meant by Celestius, has always been taken for the same that is ordinarily known by that name.

IX. There would have been the less need of this long disquisition to prove that the forecited passages of Origen are genuine, if that passage of his, which sir Peter (now lord chief justice) King has found out in the original Greek of his Commentaries on St. Matthew, and produces<sup>c</sup> to this purpose as an evidence for infant baptism, were not a very ambiguous one. If the sentence had ended there where sir Peter cuts it off, it had been a plain case that Origen must have been understood to speak there of infants in age. But some words which he has left out, do, when they are read with the rest, very much puzzle the cause, and make it doubtful whether Origen be to be there understood of infants in age, or of such Christian men as are indued with the innocence and simplicity of infants. The im-

<sup>b</sup> [Marii Mercatoris opera, ed. Jo. Garnierus, Appendix Posterior ad 1<sup>am</sup> part. Diss. i. c. 8, p. 130, fol. Paris. 1673.]

<sup>c</sup> Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, &c. of the Primitive Church, p. 57. 8vo. Lond. 1712.

partial management which I have promised obliges me to set down the whole place, or else none of it.

Origen is there commenting on those words of our Saviour, Matt. xviii. 10, *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones: for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.* He has a long discourse, and something rambling: speaking sometimes of infants in age (such as our Saviour had one then before him, mentioned ver. 2.) and sometimes of men resembling infants. After which he puts this question:

*Comment. in Matt. tom. xiii. p. 331. ed. Huetii, Rhotomag. 1668.*

[§ 27. tom. iii. p. 607. ed. Benedict.]

Εἴτα πάλιν ζητήσκειν ἂν τις, πότε τῶν δεικνυμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος μικρῶν οἱ λεγόμενοι αὐτῶν ἄγγελοι προϊστανται; πότερον δεξάμενοι τὴν οἰκονομίαν περὶ αὐτοὺς διοικεῖν ἀφ' οὗ διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας, ᾧ ἐγεννήθησαν, ὥς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν καὶ ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθοῦσι, καὶ μηκέτι ὑποκείμενοι πονηρᾷ τινι δυνάμει; ἢ ἀπὸ γενέσεως, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρόγνωσιν καὶ τὸν προορισμὸν αὐτοῦ, &c.

‘Then again one may inquire, when it is that the angels here spoken of are set over those little ones shewed [or signified] by our Saviour? Whether they take the care and management of them from the time, when they by the washing of regeneration, whereby they were new born, do, as new born babes desire the sincere milk of the word, and are no longer subject to any evil power? Or from their birth, according to the foreknowledge of God and his predestinating of them,’ &c.

If Origen meant to say, that it is a question whether such a little child as our Saviour then set before the apostles, have his guardian angel given him by God from his birth, or from his baptism; then it is a plain supposal that such infants were baptized. But his mention of their desiring of the milk of the word at the time of their baptism, makes it doubtful whether he meant of such who are infants in a proper sense, or whether he had in his mind at that place such men as he had before called Christ’s little ones, i. e. men, who when converted and baptized, do become humble in spirit, &c. And this doubt is increased by observing the answer that he gives to this his own question: for he says, that for one side of it, (viz. that the guardian angel is given to every one from his birth,) these places of scripture do make: *God, who separated me from my mother’s womb*<sup>d</sup>: and, *Before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee*, &c. But for the other side (viz. that it is at baptism that the good angel

<sup>d</sup> Gal. i. 15.

<sup>e</sup> Jer. i. 5.



is given) this does make, that *the time of people's unbelief is under the angels of Satan: and then after their new birth, he that has bought us with his own blood delivers them to a good angel.* He has also another fancy, that possibly the evil angel that presides over a man during his heathenism, is at the man's conversion converted also himself, and becomes a good angel to him.

Moreover in the text itself, though our Saviour had begun his discourse with taking a little child, and telling them they must *humble themselves as that little child*; yet in the process of it, (and before he came to speak the forecited words,) viz. at ver. 6. he uses the phrase of *little ones which believe in him.*

So that upon the whole, the proof of infant baptism from this place of Origen does labour under considerable ambiguity; and it is better for the paedobaptists not so to rely upon it for a proof of Origen's sense, but that they do adhere likewise to those passages of his which I recited before; which, though they are but translations of such books of his, the original whereof is not now extant, yet they are, as I have shewn, translations well attested.

I will add to this, one passage more, in which Origen brings in this text of scripture, which is,

*Hom. 9. in Josuam, § 4.*

He is speaking of that text, Joshua viii. 33, how Joshua wrote a copy of the law of Moses on the stones of the altar: and that he did it *in the presence of the children of Israel.* And in allusion to this, speaking of our Saviour's writing his law, not on stones, but in the hearts of his disciples, he finds this way to prove that this also is done *in the presence of the children of Israel.* He says that the word *Israel* signifies *a mind that sees God*; and that that definition fits well to angels: and that the angels are to be thought to be present at the giving of the holy sacraments. And then he adds:

‘Secundum Domini sententiam dicentis de infantibus (quod et tu fuisti infans in baptismo) *quia angeli eorum semper vident faciem Patris mei qui in cælis est.* Coram istis igitur filiis Israel qui aderant illo in tempore cum tibi fidei sacramenta tradebantur, videntibus faciem Dei, Jesus in corde tuo deuteronomium scripsit.’

‘According to that saying of our Lord concerning infants, (and thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized,) *their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.* So then Jesus wrote his law in thy heart in the presence of those children of Israel, beholders of God's face, at the time when the sacrament of faith was given thee.’

All that is doubtful in this place too, is, whether when he says,

‘Thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized,’ he mean an infant in age, or only an infant in the foresaid spiritual sense. Erasmus takes it in the former sense, for in his edition of Origen’s works, he, or else Grynæus the editor, sets in the margin of that place, the word *pædobaptismus*.

Though this part of Origen’s works be not extant in Greek, yet we may the more depend upon it, because Rufinus assures us, that in the translation of these Homilies, and those on Judges, he has neither added nor omitted any thing, but truly rendered what he found in the Greek books. *Perorat. in Hom. ad Romanos.*

X. But whatever be determined concerning the sense, or concerning the authenticalness of this, or of any other one particular saying of Origen; that he in his books did generally speak of baptism as given to infants, is plain by this: that St. Hierome (who was of all the Latin fathers the greatest reader of Origen’s works in their original language) does acquaint us, both that he did so, and also that he built his false hypothesis of the preexistence of souls on this ground partly; that by it he might give the better account of the sins for which an infant is baptized. For St. Hierome in his Third Dialogue against the Pelagians, having upbraided them that they could not apprehend what the scripture teaches of original sin in infants, as derived from Adam, for the forgiveness whereof they should be baptized, says to them in the last words of that book:

‘Quod si injusta vobis videtur alienorum remissio peccatorum; qua non indiget, qui peccare non potuit: transite ad Amasium vestrum, qui præterita in cœlis et antiqua delicta solvi dicit in baptismo. Ut ejus in cæteris auctoritate ducimini, etiam in hac parte errorem sequamini<sup>f</sup>.’

‘And if the forgiveness of sins, which are the sins of another, do seem to you unjust, or such as he [an infant] that could commit no sin himself, has no need of; then march over to your beloved [plainly meaning Origen], who holds that in baptism are forgiven those sins which have been committed in a former state in the celestial regions: and as you are influenced by his authority in your other points, partake of his error in this too.’ The place, with the context, I must recite hereafter, ch. xxix. § 26.

XI. Now Origen, or any other ancient, mentioning a practice as received, and giving a false ground for it, is as good a witness of the practice itself as the most orthodox mentioner of it.

If there were found in these translations of Origen but one or two

<sup>f</sup> [Opera, tom. ii. p. 792. ed. Vallars.]

places, and those in Rufinus alone, that did speak of infant baptism ; there might have been suspicion of their being interpolations. But when there are so many of them, brought in on several occasions, in translations made by several men, who were of several parties and enemies to one another, (as St. Hierome and Rufinus were,) and upon no tentation (for it is certain that in their time there was no dispute about infant baptism) that they should be all without any reason forged, is absurd to think.

Especially if we consider that these translators lived not much more than an hundred years after Origen's time ; and the Christians then must know whether infants had been used to be baptized in Origen's time, or not ; the very tradition from father to son must have carried a memory of it for so short a time. And then, for them to make Origen speak of a thing which all the world knew was not in use in his time, must have made them ridiculous.

And besides, in the Greek remains there are sentences and expressions so like and parallel to those which I have here brought translations of, and citations of texts of scripture applied so much to the same purpose, that they do confirm these to be genuine translations. I will recite one of them, (which I have observed since the last edition,) which though it has not in so express words as the other, the particular mention of giving baptism to infants ; yet the reader will see that it supposes it to be necessary for them. It is in his

*Comment. in Matt. tom. xv. p. 391. ed. Huetii. (§ 22, 23, ed. Benedict.)*

He is there commenting on that answer of our Saviour to St. Peter's question, Matth. xix. 28, *Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, shall sit upon twelve thrones, &c.* He says, that by the regeneration in this place is meant the time of the resurrection of the dead. *Ταύτην λήφονται τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν. Αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ παλιγγενεσία, καὶνὴ τις γένεσις οὕσα, ὅτε οὐρανὸς καὶνὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶνὴ, &c.* 'This power they are to receive at the resurrection of the dead. 'For that is a regeneration, being a new generation [or birth], when 'a new heaven and a new earth are made,' &c. And he adds, *ἐκείνης δὲ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας προοίμιόν ἐστι, τὸ καλούμενον παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, &c.* And the way [or preparative, or pre-requisite] to that regeneration [in the world to come] is that which 'by Paul is called the laver [or washing] of regeneration,' &c. Then follow these words :

*Τάχα δὲ καὶ κατὰ μὲν τὴν γένεσιν οὐδεὶς ἐστι καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου, οὐδ'*



εἰ μία ἡμέρα εἴη ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὸ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως μυστήριον, ἐφ' ᾗ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἐν πεντηκοστῷ ψάλλμῳ λελεγμένον, ἕκαστος πάντων εἰς γένεσιν ἐληλυθῶτων, λέγοι, ἔχον οὕτως· "Ὅτι ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐκισσησέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου.

Κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίαν πᾶς μὲν καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἄνωθεν, ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος· ἵνα τολμήσας εἴπω, καθαρὸς δι' ἐσόπτρου καὶ ἐν αἰνίγματι. Κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἄλλην παλιγγενεσίαν, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, πᾶς ὁ εἰς τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ παλιγγενεσίαν ἐκείνην φθάσας καθαρώτατός ἐστιν ἀπὸ ῥύπου πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον, καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας φθάνων ἐπ' ἐκείνην τὴν παλιγγενεσίαν.

‘ There is perhaps in our generation [or first birth] none clean  
‘ from pollution though his life be but of one day ; because of the  
‘ mystery of our generation [or birth], in respect of which every one  
‘ of all that are born, may say that which was said by David in the  
‘ fiftieth psalm ; which was this, *I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin*  
‘ *did my mother conceive me.*

‘ But in the regeneration [or new birth] by the laver [or baptism]  
‘ every one that is born again of water and the Spirit, is clean from  
‘ pollution ; clean (as I may venture to say) *as by a glass darkly.*

‘ And in that other regeneration, *when the Son of man shall sit on*  
‘ *the throne of his glory*, every one that attains to that regeneration  
‘ in Christ, is clean from pollution in the highest degree. *Face to*  
‘ *face.* And it is by the washing of regeneration that he comes to  
‘ that other regeneration.’

If any reader compare this passage, or the other, which I cited before out of the book *Contra Celsum*, with those quotations of St. Hierome's and Rufinus's translation ; the likeness of the notions, of the style, of the chain of thought and method of arguing in each, will incline him to take them all to be of the same author, besides the proofs I gave before.

I think it is not less than forty times that Origen in his remaining Greek works does cite that text of Job xiv. which in the Septuagint translation is as he recites it, *None is free from pollution, though his life be but of one day.* Which is also cited there in both the translations of Hierome and Rufinus ; and in many other places of their translations.

And as it is said in the translations, ‘ This natural pollution of sin  
‘ must be done away by water and the Spirit ;’ so it is said to the same purpose here, that that pollution which infects every one from his first generation, so as that an infant, one day old, is not free from it, is cleansed in a good degree by the regeneration of baptism in



this world ; and perfectly at that great regeneration or restitution of all things which shall be in the world to come.

And (what I would chiefly remark) that this washing of regeneration [the baptismal regeneration in this world] is the *προοίμιον*, the beginning, or way to, or preparative, or prerequisite, of that in the other world. And that it is by this, that any one *φθάνει* does come to, or arrive at, that.

There are in all writers, and in all books, some sayings or rules, in which, though they are expressed in general and comprehensive terms, yet infants are not meant to be included. But that cannot be supposed here, because he mentions their case particularly ; and the discourse begins with speaking of their state from their birth, and from the time that they are but one day old. And when he says, that for all that are born the *προοίμιον*, whereby they may come at the future great regeneration, is baptism in this life ; though he do not here, as in the other places, express that their baptism must be in infancy ; yet the nature of his argument supposes it. For if it be necessary for all who do pass from the original polluted state to that state of perfect purity, that they have this intermediate cleansing ; Origen knew that nigh half of the persons born into the world must have it in infancy, if at all ; because they never come to adult age.

This notion of three several births, or generations, to every Christian, is common among ecclesiastical writers. I shall have occasion to cite a passage of Gregory Nazianzen speaking in the same manner. The first, his natural birth, the entrance into a polluted state. The second, his baptism, a new birth, or entrance into a cleansed state, a state of salvation. The third, his resurrection, his last and great new birth, an entrance into a glorified state. They call the third, as well as the second, a regeneration. And it is so in the highest sense of the word. Therefore when I say, that when they use the word, they always mean, or connote baptism ; I hope every reader perceives my meaning to be, that when they use that word in relation to the spiritual concerns of any person in this life, they do always refer to his baptism. For I own that the regeneration that is to be in the other life, is quite another thing.

XII. There is one circumstance that makes Origen a more competent witness to give evidence, whether the baptizing of infants had been in use time out of mind or not, than most other authors that we have left to us of that age ; because he was himself of a family that had been Christian for a long time. Tertullian and all the rest that we have mentioned, except Irenæus, must have been themselves

baptized in adult age; because they were of heathen parents, and were the first of their family that turned Christians: but Origen's father was a martyr for Christ in the persecution under Severus, the year after the apostles 102. And Eusebius<sup>g</sup> assures us, that his forefathers had been Christians for several generations; τῷ τε γὰρ Ὀριγένει τὰ τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν διδασκαλίας ἐκ προγόνων ἐσώζετο. 'The Christian doctrine was conveyed to him from his forefathers.' Or, as Rufinus<sup>h</sup> translates it, *ab avis atque atavis*, 'from his grandfathers and great-grandfathers.'

That which gave occasion to Eusebius to inquire into his pedigree, was the slander of Porphyrius: for he endeavouring to shew that the Christian religion had nothing in it of learning or science, and had none but illiterate followers; and not being able to deny or conceal the great repute of Origen for his skill in human literature, had feigned that he was at first a heathen, and having learned their philosophy, and then turning Christian, had endeavoured to transfer and apply it to trim up the Christian fables. In confutation of this lie, Eusebius, as I said, sets forth his Christian descent.

Now since Origen was born anno 185, that is, the year after the apostles, 85, (for he was seventeen years old when his father suffered,) his grandfather, or at least his great-grandfather, must have lived in the apostles' time. And as he could not be ignorant whether he was himself baptized in infancy, so he had no further than his own family to go for inquiry how it was practised in the times of the apostles.

Besides that, he was, as I said, a very learned man, and could not be ignorant of the use of the churches; in most of which he had also travelled; for as he was born and bred at Alexandria, so it appears out of Eusebius<sup>i</sup>, that he had lived in Greece, and at Rome, and in Cappadocia, and Arabia, and spent the main part of his life in Syria and Palestine.

## CHAP. VI.

### *Quotations out of St. Cyprian.*

*Cypriani Epist.* 64. (Pamelii et Benedict. editt. 59.) *ad Fidum.*

§ I. ST. CYPRIAN was bishop of Carthage. And it was the custom in that, as in all other great and metropolitical cities, for the neighbouring bishops to meet there at certain times to consult of and determine any emergent affairs of the church.

<sup>g</sup> Eccl. Hist. lib. vi. c. 19.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. c. 14.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. lib. vi.

At this time, anno Dom. 253, there were 66 of them in council. And one Fidus, a country bishop, had sent a letter with two cases, in which he desired their resolution ; which they give in this epistle to him.

One being about one Victor a presbyter, that after a crime committed, had, by the rashness of a certain bishop, been admitted too soon to absolution, is nothing to our concern.

The other question being, whether an infant, before it was eight days old, might be baptized, if need required : I shall recite so much of the letter as concerns that.

*‘ Cyprianus et cæteri Collegæ, qui in Concilio affuerunt, numero 66.*

*Fido fratri salutem.*

*‘ Legimus litteras tuas, frater carissime, quibus significasti de Victore quondam presbytero, &c. . . . Quantum vero ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti, intra secundum vel tertium diem, quo nati sunt, constitutos baptizari non oportere : et considerandam esse legem circumcisionis antiquæ ; ut intra octavum diem, eum, qui natus est, baptizandum et sanctificandum non putares, longe aliud in concilio nostro omnibus visum est. In hoc enim, quod tu putabas esse faciendum, nemo consensit : sed universi potius judicavimus nulli homini nato misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandam. Nam cum Dominus in evangelio suo dicat, *Filius hominis non venit animas hominum perdere, sed salvare* ; quantum in nobis est, si fieri potest, nulla anima perdenda est. Quid enim ei deest, qui semel in utero Dei manibus formatus est ? Nobis enim atque oculis nostris secundum dierum sæcularium cursum accipere qui nati sunt, incrementum videntur. Ceterum quæcunque a Deo fiunt, Dei factoris majestate et opere perfecta sunt. Esse denique apud omnes, sive infantes, sive majores natu, unam divini muneris æqualitatem, declarat nobis divinæ scripturæ fides. Helisæus super infantem [Sunamitidis] viduæ filium qui mortuus jacebat, ita se Deum deprecans superstravit, ut capiti caput et faciei facies applicaretur, et superfusi Helisæi membra singulis parvuli membris, et pedes pedibus jungerentur. Quæ res si secundum nativitatis nostræ et corporis inæqualitatem cogitetur, adulto et provecto infans non posset æquari, nec coherere et sufficere possent parva membra majoribus. Sed illie æqualitas divina et spiritalis exprimitur, quod pares atque æquales sint omnes homines, quando a Deo semel facti sunt, et possit ætas nostra in incrementis corporis secundum sæculum, non secundum Deum habere discrimen. Nisi si et gratia ipsa, quæ baptizatis datur, pro ætate accipientium, vel minor, vel major tribuitur ; cum spiritus sanctus non de mensura, sed de*

‘ pietate atque indulgentia paterna æqualis omnibus præbeatur. Nam  
‘ Deus ut personam non accipit, sic nec ætatem : cum se omnibus ad  
‘ cœlestis gratiæ consecutionem æqualitate librata præbeat patrem.  
‘ Nam et quod vestigium infantis, in primis partus sui diebus con-  
‘ stituti, mundum non esse dixisti, quod unusquisque nostrum adhuc  
‘ horreat exosculari : nec hoc putamus ad cœlestem gratiam dandam  
‘ impedimento esse oportere. Scriptum est enim, omnia munda sunt  
‘ mundis : nec aliquis nostrum id debet horrere, quod Deus dignatus  
‘ est facere. Nam etsi adhuc infans a partu novus est, non ita est  
‘ tamen, ut quisquam illum, in gratia danda atque in pace facienda,  
‘ horrere debeat osculari : quando in osculo infantis unusquisque  
‘ nostrum pro sua religione ipsas adhuc recentes Dei manus debeat  
‘ cogitare ; quas in homine modo formato et recens nato quodammodo  
‘ exosculamur, quando id quod Deus facit amplectimur. Nam quod  
‘ in Judaica circumcisione carnali octavus dies observabatur, sacra-  
‘ mentum est in umbra atque in imagine ante præmissum, sed  
‘ veniente Christo veritate completum : nam quia octavus dies i. e.  
‘ post sabbatum primus, dies futurus erat, quo Dominus resurgeret,  
‘ et nos vivificaret, et circumcisionem nobis spiritalem daret : hic  
‘ dies octavus i. e. post sabbatum primus et Dominicus præcessit in  
‘ imagine ; quæ imago cessavit superveniente postmodum veritate,  
‘ et data nobis spiritali circumcisione. Propter quod neminem pu-  
‘ tamus a gratia consequenda impediendum esse ea lege quæ jam  
‘ statuta est, nec spiritalem circumcisionem impediri carnali circum-  
‘ cisione debere : sed omnem omnino hominem admittendum esse ad  
‘ gratiam Christi : quando et Petrus in Actis Apostolorum loquatur  
‘ et dicat, *Dominus mihi dixit neminem hominum communem dicendum*  
‘ *et immundum*. Ceterum si homines impedire aliquid ad consecu-  
‘ tionem gratiæ posset ; magis adultos et proectos et majores natu  
‘ possent impedire peccata graviora. Porro autem si etiam gra-  
‘ vissimis delictoribus, et in Deum multum ante peccantibus, cum  
‘ postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur, et a baptismo atque  
‘ a gratia nemo prohibetur : quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans,  
‘ qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod, secundum Adam carna-  
‘ liter natus, contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit ?  
‘ qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit,  
‘ quod illi remittuntur non propria, sed aliena peccata. Et ideoque,  
‘ frater carissime, hæc fuit in concilio nostra sententia, a baptismo  
‘ atque a gratia Dei, qui omnibus misericors et benignus et pius est,  
‘ neminem per nos debere prohiberi. Quod cum circa universos  
‘ observandum sit atque retinendum ; tum magis circa infantes ipsos  
‘ et recens natos observandum putamus, qui hoc ipso de ope nostra



‘ ac de divina misericordia plus merentur, quod in primo statim natiuitatis suæ ortu plorantes ac flentes, nihil aliud faciunt quam deprecantur. Optamus te, frater carissime, semper bene valere.’

*‘ Cyprian and the rest of the bishops who were present at the council, sixty-six in number, to Fidus our brother, greeting.’*

‘ We read your letter, most dear brother, in which you write of one Victor a priest, &c. . . . But as to the case of infants : whereas you judge that they must not be baptized within two or three days after they are born ; and that the rule of circumcision is to be observed, so that none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born : we were all in our assembly of the contrary opinion. For as for what you thought fitting to be done, there was not one that was of your mind, but all of us on the contrary, judged that the grace and mercy of God is to be denied to no person that is born. For whereas our Lord in his gospel says, *The Son of man came not to destroy men’s souls* [or lives] *but to save them* : as far as lies in us, no soul, if possible, is to be lost.

‘ For what is there deficient in him who has been once formed in the womb by the hands of God ? They appear to us and in our eyes to attain perfection [or increase] in the course of the days of the world ; but all things that are made by God are perfect by the work and power of God their maker. The scripture gives us to understand the equality of the divine gift on all, whether infants or grown persons. Elisha, in his prayer to God, stretched himself on the infant son of the Shunamite woman that lay dead, in such manner that his head, and face, and limbs, and feet were applied to the head, face, limbs, and feet of the child ; which, if it be understood according to the quality of our body and nature, the infant could not hold measure with the grown man, nor its little limbs fit and reach to his great ones. But in that place a spiritual equality, and such as is in the esteem of God, is intimated to us ; by which persons that are once made by God are alike and equal ; and our growth of body by age makes a difference in the sense of the world, but none of God. Unless you will think that the grace itself, which is given to baptized persons, is greater or less, according to the age of those that receive it ; whereas the Holy Spirit is given not by different measures, but with fatherly affection and kindness equal to all. For God, as he accepts no one’s person, so not his age ; but with an exact equality shews himself a father to all for their obtaining the heavenly grace.

‘ And whereas you say, that an infant in the first days after its birth is unclean, so that any of us abhors to kiss it. We think

‘ not this neither to be any reason to hinder the giving to it the  
‘ heavenly grace. For it is written, *to the clean all things are clean* :  
‘ nor ought any of us to abhor that which God has vouchsafed to  
‘ make. Though an infant come fresh from the womb, no one  
‘ ought to abhor to kiss it at the giving of the grace and the own-  
‘ ing of the peace [or brotherhood,] when as in kissing the infant,  
‘ every one of us ought, out of devotion, to think of the fresh handy-  
‘ work of God : for we do in some sense kiss his hands in the person  
‘ newly formed and but new born, when we embrace that which is  
‘ of his making.

‘ That the eighth day was observed in the Jewish circumcision,  
‘ was a type going before in a shadow and resemblance ; but on  
‘ Christ’s coming was fulfilled in the substance. For because the  
‘ eighth day, that is, the next to the sabbath-day, was to be the  
‘ day on which the Lord was to rise from the dead and quicken us,  
‘ and give us the spiritual circumcision ; this eighth day, that is,  
‘ the next day to the sabbath, or Lord’s day, was signified in the  
‘ type before ; which type ceased when the substance came, and the  
‘ spiritual circumcision was given to us.

‘ So that we judge that no person is to be hindered from obtaining  
‘ the grace, by the law that is now appointed ; and that the spirit-  
‘ ual circumcision ought not to be restrained by the circumcision  
‘ that was according to the flesh : but that all are to be admitted  
‘ to the grace of Christ ; since Peter, speaking in the Acts of the  
‘ Apostles, says, *The Lord has shewn me that no person is to be called*  
‘ *common or unclean*.

‘ If any thing could be an obstacle to persons against their ob-  
‘ taining the grace, the adult and grown and elder men would be  
‘ rather hindered by their more grievous sins. If then the greatest  
‘ offenders, and they that have grievously sinned against God before,  
‘ have when they afterward come to believe, forgiveness of their  
‘ sins ; and no person is kept off from baptism and the grace : how  
‘ much less reason is there to refuse an infant, who, being newly  
‘ born, has no sin, save that being descended from Adam according  
‘ to the flesh, he has from his very birth contracted the contagion  
‘ of the death anciently threatened : who comes for this reason more  
‘ easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own  
‘ but others’ sins that are forgiven him.

‘ This, therefore, dear brother, was our opinion in the assembly ;  
‘ that it is not for us to hinder any person from baptism and the  
‘ grace of God, who is merciful and kind and affectionate to all.  
‘ Which rule, as it holds for all, so we think it more especially to

‘ be observed in reference to infants and persons newly born: to whom our help and the divine mercy is rather to be granted, because by their weeping and wailing at their first entrance into the world, they do intimate nothing so much as that they implore compassion.

‘ Dear brother, we wish you always good health.’

It is not denied by any but that this is a plain proof of infants’ baptism being taken for granted at that time: since both Fidus, who puts the question, and the council that resolve it, do shew by their words their sense to be that they are to be baptized in infancy; only Fidus thought not before the eighth day.

Mr. Tombes, who makes some exceptions against the foregoing testimonies, as not being plain declarations of the author’s mind, or not certainly genuine, (but yet no other exceptions than what I have mentioned,) grants this to be plain, and to ‘ say enough, and more than enough, except it had spoke more to the purpose, and would have it pass for the spring head of infant baptism<sup>i</sup>.’

II. But there is one antipædobaptist writer, a man of more boldness in his assertions than the rest, that would represent this as a forged or supposititious piece. ‘ We would rather believe,’ says he, ‘ that these things were foisted into his writings by that villainous cursed generation, that so horribly abused the writings of most of the ancients<sup>k</sup>.’

But as Mr. Tombes was more wary and learned than to object any such thing, so there could not have been any thing more unluckily pleaded. For so it happens, that in all antiquity there is not any one piece that can more certainly be proved to be genuine than this: because it is so often quoted by St. Hierome and St. Austin, that lived a while after; not in any question of infant baptism, but of original sin, which the Pelagians denied, though they, as I shall shew hereafter, granted and practised infant baptism. I shall have occasion in the following chapters to cite some of the passages of the foresaid fathers where they mention this epistle of St. Cyprian, and at present shall refer the reader to such places of St. Austin, where he transcribes large passages verbatim out of it, so as to recite it by parcels almost all.

In his Ep. 28. ad Hieronym. he, speaking of some that taught that the body only, and not the soul, must suffer for original sin, says among other things this: ‘ Blessed Cyprian, not making any new decree, but expressing the firm faith of the church, in refuting

<sup>i</sup> Examen, p. 10, 11.

<sup>k</sup> H. Danvers, Treatise of Baptism, part ii. c. 3. 8vo. 1674.



‘those that thought a child must not be baptized before the eighth day, said (not that no flesh, but) that no soul must be lost.’

And lib. 4. *contra duas Epist. Pelagianorum*, cap. 8, he recites three large passages out of it.

And lib. 3. *De Peccatorum meritis et remissione*, c. 5, having mentioned this epistle, he tells Marcellinus, the nobleman, to whom he writes, ‘You may, if you please, read the epistle itself of the said martyr about the baptizing of infants: for there is no doubt but it is to be had at Carthage. However, I have thought fit to transcribe some part of it, as much as is necessary for our present question,’ [which was about original sin.] So he begins where I began; ‘but as to the case of infants: whereas you judge they must not be baptized within two or three days,’ &c. and goes on to repeat two large paragraphs verbatim out of it.

Also having occasion to <sup>1</sup>preach at Carthage against Pelagianism, he, towards the end of his sermon, recites to the people some part of this epistle, telling them, that, ‘they are the words of Cyprian, an ancient bishop of that see.’ ‘Holy Cyprian,’ says he, ‘was asked whether an infant might be baptized before the eighth day, because in the old law it was not lawful to circumcise but on the eighth day. The question was of the day of baptizing, for of original sin there was no question: and therefore from a thing of which there was no question, the question that was started was resolved. St. Cyprian said, among other things, “So that we judge that no person is to be hindered from obtaining the grace, &c. [proceeding to those words] because they are not his own but others’ sins that are forgiven him.” See how he, making no doubt of this matter [viz. of original sin] solves that of which there was doubt; he took this from the foundation of the church to fasten a stone that was loose.’

St. Hierome also quotes a good part of it verbatim, l. iii. *Dialog. adv. Pelag.*

III. Since then it is plain that it was at that time, and in those places where St. Cyprian had lived commonly known for his, and frequent in the hands of learned men; there is the less need of considering those objections which are brought as probable against its being genuine.

The aforesaid author says, ‘We meet with no such council, neither can it appear where it was held.’

But this is to make himself more ignorant than he is, as if he did not know that the date of this is before those times, in which

<sup>1</sup> Serm. 14. de Verbis Apost.



the acts of the councils used to be registered and collected into volumes: so that this had been lost, if it had not been preserved among the epistles of this father. And besides, that they never used to put into the volumes of councils the acts of those ordinary assemblies in which the neighbouring bishops met every half year at the principal city, (whereof this was one, viz. St. Cyprian's neighbouring colleagues assembled at Carthage,) but only those in which some extraordinary matter was handled.

IV. Yet this is proper to observe here, that whereas Grotius would prove that 'infant baptism was not universally held to be ' necessary, because in the councils one finds no earlier mention of ' it than in the council of Carthage<sup>m</sup>,' meaning that in the year 418. We see here that though that were true, (which I shall by and by shew to be false<sup>n</sup>,) that there were no earlier mention of it in those councils that are in the ordinary collections; yet there is mention of it in this, that was earlier than any of them; and though met on ordinary occasions, more numerous than several of them.

V. It is objected, likewise, that whereas St. Austin somewhere lays down this as a rule, that ' what the whole church through all ' the world does practise, and yet it has not been instituted in councils, but has been always in use, is with very good reason supposed ' to have been settled by authority of the apostles<sup>o</sup>,' and applies that rule to infant baptism; he consequently takes it not to have been instituted by any council; and therefore that he contradicts himself when he believes there was such a council as this letter mentions.

But there needs nothing but for a man to open his eyes to see that this council does not institute the baptism of infants, or enact that they should be baptized; but takes that for granted, or as a thing known and supposed by both parties, that they are to be baptized: and determines only that question, whether they may be baptized before the eighth day. Which very thing St. Austin notes in the words I just now cited, Ep. 28. 'Cyprian not making any ' new decree,' &c.

VI. Another exception that is made has, I think, some truth in it, viz. That some of the reasons used in this council, and expressed in this letter, do appear something frivolous and shallow. But I do not see how it is at all to the purpose.

1. Because these reasons are not designed to prove infant baptism, but to take off the objections concerning the eighth day.

2. If they had been used by these bishops as grounds of infant

<sup>m</sup> Annot. in Matt. 19.

<sup>n</sup> Ch. xvi.

<sup>o</sup> De Baptismo contra Donatistas, lib. iv. c. 23.

baptism; yet since our inquiry is what the church then practised, and not how able St. Cyprian and they were to argue; their evidence is the same, how weak soever their reasonings are. But,

3. This also may be said in apology for their abilities; that to a frivolous and foolish question or objection, it is almost impossible to give any answer that will not seem frivolous to those that consider not the occasion of it. On this account Irenæus and many of the fathers suffer in our judgment; they are forced to write a great deal in confutation of such idle and enthusiastical stuff as seems to us not to deserve three words: but it was necessary then to disentangle the souls of ignorant Christians. So any book written now in answer to the reasonings of the Quakers, &c., will in the next age seem to be the work of a man that had little to do. This Fidus thought that the natural uncleanness of an infant in the first days after his birth was a reason against baptizing it then; which, as Rigaltius observes, was a relick of heathenish superstition. He also seems to have made some question whether so young an infant be a perfect human creature; as if eight days made any great difference in that matter. The answers to such arguments will seem of little weight. All that he objected of sense was the rule of circumcision on the eighth day. To which St. Cyprian answers, as other fathers do, that the circumstance of the day was typical, and so not now obliging.

VII. If we look back from this time to the space that had passed from the apostles' time, which was but 150 years; we must conclude that it was easy then to know the practice of Christians in the apostles' days. For some of these sixty-six bishops must be thought to be at this time 70 or 80 years old themselves, which reaches to half the space: and at that time when they were infants, there must have been several alive that were born within the apostles' age. And such could not be ignorant whether infants were baptized in that age, when they themselves were some of those infants.

It is plain likewise that there was no dispute or difference of opinion (as there must have been among so many, if any innovation had been made.) For it is here said, 'there was not one of Fidus' 'mind,' that infant baptism must be delayed till the eighth day. Much less then was there any of opinion that it was not to be used at all.

'In a doctrinal point,' as Mr. Baxter well observes, 'a mistake is easier, or in a bare narration of some one fact: but in a matter of fact of so public notice, and which so many thousands were partakers in, as baptism was, how could they be ignorant?'

Suppose it were a question now among us, whether persons were baptized at age only, or in infancy also, 70 or 80 years before we were born: were it not easy to know the truth, what by tradition and what by records?

VIII. I shall conclude what I have to note on this testimony with observing these things:

I. That it was the custom of those times and places to give the new-baptized person, whether infant or adult, the kiss of peace, or as it is called by St. Peter<sup>p</sup> and St. Paul<sup>q</sup>, the *holy kiss*, or the *kiss of charity*, in token of their owning him for a Christian brother: for Fidus makes that a part of his objection, that that would be indecent or loathsome in the case of a new-born infant, before it be a week old.

IX. 2. That these bishops held, that to suffer the infant to die unbaptized was to endanger its salvation. This appears in their reasonings.

X. 3. The third is a various reading or spelling of one word in this epistle, from whence some disputes have arisen. Mr. Daillé, in a book written on purpose to publish the *Nævi* and errors which he could find in the fathers' works<sup>r</sup>, reckons St. Cyprian one of the first of those from whose words one may prove there was a custom of giving the holy communion to infants. And he proves it first and chiefly from this epistle, in which, as it is here written, there is never a word about it. But where we read in the first clause of it, *baptizandum et sanctificandum*<sup>s</sup>, 'should be baptized and sanctified,' (which latter word is commonly used as another word for baptism,) he quotes it, *baptizandum et sacrificandum*, by which he understands, 'should be baptized and partake of the eucharist.' Some editions, it seems, have it so; but, I suppose, very few: and those mistaken ones. For Dr. Hammond<sup>t</sup>, Marshall<sup>u</sup>, and the Magdeburgenses<sup>v</sup>, and Mr. Walker<sup>w</sup>, and all that I have seen, do quote it *sanctificandum*, as it is also in the last edition, viz. Oxon, 1682<sup>x</sup>, in which are the various lections of several manuscripts that had been collated: but no variety in reading of this word. And the matter is out of doubt; since St. Austin, transcribing that part of the epistle, writes

<sup>p</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 20.

<sup>q</sup> 1 Pet. v. 14.

<sup>r</sup> De Usu Patrum, l. ii. c. 4. [4to. Geneva, 1656. There is an English version, printed in 1651.]

<sup>s</sup> On the various reading of this passage, *sanctificandum* and *sacrificandum*, see a full discussion by Mr. Joseph Clarke, in his preface to Waterland's Sermons, published in the ninth volume of his works, edited by Bishop Van Mildert, p. xxvi. &c.

<sup>t</sup> Six Queries, Inf. Bapt. § 36.

<sup>u</sup> [A Defence of Infant Baptism, in answer to two treatises and an appendix lately published by Mr. Jo. Tombes; by Steven Marshall, B. D. 4to. 1646, p. 39.]

<sup>v</sup> [The Centuriators, or authors of the 'Centuriæ Magdeburgenses,' folio.]

<sup>w</sup> [Modest Plea, c. xxxix. § 4, p. 296.]

<sup>x</sup> [So likewise in the Benedictine edition, Paris, 1726.]

<sup>y</sup> Lib. iv. contra duas Epist. Pelagianorum, c. 8.



it *sanctificandum*. And indeed *sacrificandum* in that sense is not Latin.

From this use of the word *sanctification* for *baptism*, and *sanctified* or *made holy* for *baptized*, (which I shall shew<sup>z</sup> hereafter to have been very common and usual,) the fathers do give light to the explication of that text of St. Paul 1 Cor. vii. 14; as I shall more fully shew at a fitter place<sup>z</sup>.

4. We see also here confirmed, what I said<sup>a</sup> before, that they reckoned baptism to be to us in the room of circumcision. For it was upon that account, that Fidus thought it must keep the times of the old circumcision: and the bishops of the council, though denying that, do call it ‘the spiritual [or Christian] circumcision.’

Another passage out of St. Cyprian.

*Libro de Lapsis, circa Medium.* (pag. 183. ed. Bened. 1726.)

XI. There had been at Carthage a great persecution of the Christians, in which many had fallen, and had denied their religion, and had joined in the idolatrous sacrifices: some of which afterward, when the persecution was over, went about to crowd themselves into the church, without giving first any sufficient proofs of their repentance for so horrid a crime, or expecting the consent of the church for their readmission. St. Cyprian thought it necessary for these men to be first made sensible of the guilt they had contracted: for which purpose he writes this book; and has, among others, this passage, in which he mentions their infants; and though there be no express mention of their baptism, yet you will see it is in other words plainly described.

‘Nonne, quando ad Capitolium sponte ventum est, quando ultro  
‘ad obsequium diri facinoris accessum est, labavit gressus, caligavit  
‘aspectus, tremuerunt viscera, brachia conciderunt? Nonne sensus  
‘obstupuit, lingua hæsit, sermo defecit? Stare illic potuit Dei ser-  
‘vus, et loqui et renunciare Christo, qui jam diabolo renunciaverat  
‘et seculo? Nonne ara illa, quo moriturus accessit, rogus illi fuit?  
‘Nonne diaboli altare, quod fœtore tetro fumare ac redolere con-  
‘spexerat, velut funus et bustum vitæ suæ, horrere ac fugere debe-  
‘bat? quid hostiam tecum, miser, quid victimam immolaturus  
‘imponis? ipse ad aram hostia, victima ipse venisti. Immolasti  
‘illic salutem tuam; spem tuam, fidem tuam funestis illis ignibus  
‘concremast. Ac multis proprius interitus satis non fuit:horta-  
‘mentis mutuis in exitium populus impulsus est: mors invicem  
‘lethali poculo propinata est. Ac ne quid deesset ad criminis cumu-  
‘lum, infantes quoque parentum manibus vel impositi vel attracti,

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xi. sect. 9.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. ii. sect. 2.



‘ amiserunt parvuli quod in primo statim nativitatis exordio fuerant consecuti. Nonne illi, cum judicii dies venerit, dicent; nos nihil mali fecimus, nec derelicto cibo et poculo Domini ad profana contagia sponte properavimus: perdidit nos aliena perfidia, parentes sensimus parricidas. Illi nobis ecclesiam matrem, illi patrem Deum negaverunt: ut dum parvi et improvidi et tanti facinoris ignari per alios ad consortium criminum jungimur, aliena fraude caperemur?’

‘ When you came to the Capitol, [the idol temple,] when you went with a ready compliance to the committing of that horrible crime, did not your legs tremble, your sight wax dim, your bowels turn, and your arms flag? Did not your mind grow amazed, your tongue falter, and your speech fail you? Could one that was God’s servant stand there and speak out, and renounce Christ, who had before renounced the devil and the world? Was not the altar of incense a funeral pile to him, since he came thither to take his [spiritual] death? Had he not reason to abhor and fly from the altar of sacrifice to the devil; which he saw smoke and stink with a nasty smell, as from the funeral fire which signified the forfeiture of his life? What need hadst thou, poor wretch, to bring thy offering or sacrifice thither with thee? Thou camest thyself a sacrifice and a burnt-offering to the altar. Thou didst there sacrifice thy salvation: thou didst burn up all thy hope and faith in those deadly fires.

‘ There were also a great many that thought it not enough to procure their own damnation. The multitude encouraged one another to their destruction: they drank death to one another, and pledged each other in that poisonous cup.

‘ And that nothing might be wanting to the measure of their wickedness, their little infants also being led or brought in their parents’ arms, lost that which they had obtained presently after they were born. Will not they at the day of judgment say, “ We did nothing of this, neither did we, forsaking the meat and cup of our Lord, run of our own accord to the partaking of those profane defilements. It was the apostasy of others that ruined us; we had our parents for our murderers. It was they that renounced for us the church from being our mother, and God from being our father. When we, being young and inconsiderate, and not sensible of the greatness of the crime, were made partakers of the wickedness, we were entrapped by the treachery of others.” ’

XII. When he says, ‘ the infants lost [or forfeited] that [gift or grace] which they had obtained presently after they were born;’ it is plain that he means their baptism, or the benefits thereof. St.

Austin had occasion to recite these words of St. Cyprian, and to give his comment on them. The occasion was this; one Boniface had put to him this question; ‘whether parents do their children ‘that are baptized any hurt, when they carry them to the heathen ‘sacrifices to be cured of any illness? and, if they thereby do them ‘no hurt, then how it comes to pass that the faith of the parents ‘stands them in stead when they are baptized; and yet their apostasy afterward should not be able to hurt them?’

St. Austin<sup>b</sup> answers, that ‘the force of that sacrament is such, ‘that he that is once regenerated by it cannot afterwards be entangled in the guilt of another person’s sin, to which he does ‘not consent.’ He gives the reason of the difference to this purpose; that the guilt of original sin descends from the parent to the child, because the child is not as yet a separate living person, *anima separatim vivens*, from his parent. But when a child is become *in se ipso alter ab eo qui genuit*, ‘in himself a separate person from him ‘that begot him,’ he is not guilty of his parent’s sin done without his consent. He derived his guilt, because he was one with him and in him from whom he derived, at the time when it was derived to him: but one does not derive from another, when each has his own proper life; so as it may be said, *the soul that sinneth it shall die*. That the faith and godly will of the parent in bringing his child to baptism is available, because the same spirit that sanctifies and regenerates the child moves the parent to offer him to baptism. ‘The regenerating spirit,’ says he, ‘is one and the same in the ‘parents that bring him, and in the infant that is brought and regenerated.—And the guilt is not so communicated by another ‘person’s will, as the grace is communicated by the unity [or ‘identity] of the spirit.’

‘Yet (as he observes afterward) the parents or other guardians ‘that endeavour thus to entangle their children or other infants in ‘this sacrilege of the Devil, are deservedly called spiritual murderers. For they do not, it is true, effect any murder upon them; ‘but yet as far as it lies in them they are murderers: and we do ‘with reason say to them, Do not murder your infants. For the ‘apostle says, *Quench not* [or extinguish not] *the Spirit*: not that ‘he can be extinguished, but yet they are fitly called extinguishers ‘of him as much as in them lies, that would have him extinguished.’

Then it is that he takes notice of this passage of St. Cyprian, and says, ‘In this sense may that be rightly understood which St. ‘Cyprian wrote in his Epistle concerning the *lapsi*, when reproving

<sup>b</sup> Ep. 23. ad Bonifacium.

‘ those that had in the time of persecution sacrificed to idols, he says, “And that nothing might be wanting to the measure of their wickedness, their little infants also being led or brought in their parents’ arms, lost that which they had obtained, presently after they were born, &c.” They lost it, he means, as far as concerns the wickedness of those by whom they were brought to lose it, in the will and purpose of those that committed so foul a wickedness upon them. For if they had lost it indeed as to themselves, they would have continued as persons to be condemned by the sentence of God without any excuse: which if St. Cyprian had thought to be so, he would not presently have subjoined their excuse, saying, “ Will not they at the day of judgment say,”’ &c.

XIII. There is one place more in St. Cyprian, where he speaks of all persons in general; yet because he names not infants particularly, I shall but just mention it. It is

Libro iii. *Testimoniorum ad Quirinum*, c. 25.

This is a commonplace-book of the heads of Christian doctrine, collected by this father, and proper texts of scripture added for the proof of each of them.

The doctrine or proposition for this chapter is this:

‘ Ad regnum Dei, nisi baptizatus et renatus quis fuerit, pervenire non posse.’ ‘ If any one be not baptized and regenerate, he cannot come to the kingdom of God.’

The texts of scripture are, among other, these:

‘ In Evangelio cata Joannem: Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei. Quod enim natum est de carne, caro est; et quod natum est de Spiritu, spiritus est.’ In the Gospel according to St. John: ‘ Except any one be regenerate of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. For that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.’

XIV. We have in our English language a way of speaking, whereby instead of the word *person* in a sentence, we generally use the word *man*, though the sense be such as requires to be understood of any human creature; man, woman, or child. And so in the text of St. John here cited, John iii. 5, though the original be ἐὰν μὴ τὸς, &c. and all Latin books and writers translate it, as Cyprian here does, *Nisi quis*, &c., which signifies, *Except one* [or except any one, or except a person] *be born*, &c.; yet the English translators have rendered it, *Except a man be born*, &c. And some English antipædobaptists (learned ones you will say) have taken the advantage of the word *man* to prove that it is of a grown person in exclusion of



children, that our Saviour speaks. But the more wary of them, finding that this argument will from the original turn strongly against them, are willing to compound, and leave this text quite out of the dispute, and say that our Saviour does not there speak of baptism at all.

There is not any one Christian writer of any antiquity in any language but what understands it of baptism. And if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of water, any more than born of wood.

I shall have occasion to speak more particularly<sup>c</sup> of the sense of the ancients concerning this text. In the mean time, we see here plainly that St. Cyprian understands it of baptism: and also we see by reading the foregoing epistle to Fidus, that he and his fellow bishops understood the case of infants particularly to be included in it.

There is another passage in St. Cyprian, from which is plainly inferred the baptism of infants, because it shews that in his church the custom was to give the communion to them at the age of four or five years. But since it mentions not their baptism expressly, I shall reserve it to the chapter<sup>d</sup> where I speak of the custom that was in some churches of their communicating.

## CHAP. VII.

### *A Quotation out of the Council of Eliberis.*

*Concil. Eliberitanum*, [anno 305,] Can. 22.

§ I. ‘ SI quis de catholica ecclesia ad hæresim transitum fecerit,  
<sup>205.</sup> ‘ rursusque [ad ecclesiam] recurrerit: placuit, huic pœniten-  
 (A.D. 305.) ‘ tiam non esse denegandam, eo quod cognoverit peccatum  
 ‘ suum: qui etiam decem annis agat pœnitentiam; cui post decem  
 ‘ annos præstari communio debet. Si vero infantes fuerint trans-  
 ‘ ducti; quod non suo vitio peccaverint, incunctanter recipi debent.’

‘ If any one go over from the catholic church to any heresy [or sect]  
 ‘ and do return again to the church; it is resolved that penance be  
 ‘ not denied to such an one; because he acknowledges his fault.  
 ‘ Let him be in a state of penance for ten years, and after ten years  
 ‘ he ought to be admitted to communion. But if they were infants  
 ‘ when they were carried over; inasmuch as it was not by their own  
 ‘ fault that they sinned, they ought to be admitted presently.’

Here is indeed no express mention of these infants having been

<sup>c</sup> Part ii. ch. vi. sect. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Part ii. ch. ix. sect. 15, 16, 17.



baptized in the catholic church before they were carried over to the sect. But inasmuch as they are said to be *transducti*, ‘carried over’ from the catholic church; it is, I think, plainly implied. For the phrase of all antiquity is not to call any one of the church till he be baptized. Be he infant or adult that is designed to be a Christian, till he be baptized they call him *catechumenus*: and a catechumen is not yet of the church. We perceive by St. Austin in many places,<sup>e</sup> that it was a common thing for the neighbours or any visitant to ask concerning a Christian’s infant child, is he *fidelis* or *catechumenus*? i. e. is he yet baptized or not? So that an infant or adult person was not reckoned *fidelis* or of the church till his baptism. And therefore to speak of infants conveyed over from the catholic church to any sect, is to suppose them first baptized in the catholic church, and afterward by their parents or others carried to the congregations of the sectaries, and educated in that way. The council decrees that such upon their return to the catholic church shall be received without any penance.

Concerning the time of this council, I shall not enter into any of the nice inquiries. Almost all chronologers place it as I here do, viz. anno Dom. 305. Baluzius will have it to be ten or fifteen years later. A main exception against moving the date of it any lower is, that a great many of the canons of it do enact what penance is necessary in the several cases of such as through fear do deny the Christian religion, or comply to sacrifice to the idol gods. This is a sign that persecution reigned at that time, at least in Spain: but every body knows that a little after this time persecution for the Christian religion ceased in all the world.

II. That which will make a reader, that is not acquainted with antiquity, wonder is, that these ancient fathers do inflict so severe a penance on those that had run into any sect. They ordain that such must be kept in a state of penance (i. e. of humiliation and asking pardon of God and the church) for ten years’ time before they be admitted to full communion: except they were infants when they were carried over.

The commonness of a sin does in most men wonderfully abate the sense of the guilt of it. Nowadays if men have run into schism, and do afterwards think fit to return to the church; they are so far from being sensible of any guilt that they have incurred, that they think their very return does lay a great obligation on the church. In short, many Christians that take the word of God, not as it lies, but as

<sup>e</sup> Serm. 14. de Verbis Apost. et alibi.

their prejudices have represented, do think that adultery indeed is a sin, and drunkenness is a sin, but that schism is none.

But all the ancient Christians do express the same sentiment of the guilt of schism as St. Paul does, who<sup>f</sup> reckons those that make divisions, seditions, and heresies in the church among the most capital offenders, which *shall not inherit the kingdom of God*: such as murderers, adulterers, &c., and commands that they be excommunicated, or avoided<sup>g</sup> by all good Christians. Nor has God ever passed any act of indulgence or toleration in abatement of that law.

## CHAP. VIII.

*A Quotation out of the Council of Neocæsarea.* [anno 314.]

§ I. **THOUGH** this council mentions nothing at all about infants or their baptism; yet Grotius<sup>h</sup> seems to himself to have found a proof out of it that many in that age judged that they are not to be baptized. Bp. Taylor<sup>i</sup> from him, and from them others, prosecute the argument.

So much is plain, that some about that time and place had put this question; whether a woman with child, that had a mind to become a Christian and be baptized, might conveniently receive baptism during her going with child, or must stay till she was delivered. And it is agreed likewise that the reason of the doubt was, because when she was immersed into the water, the child in her womb did seem to some to be baptized with her: and consequently they were apt to argue that that child must not be baptized, or would not need to be baptized, afterward for itself. This any one will conclude from the words of the council, which are these:

*Concilii Neocæsariensis, canon 6.*

Περὶ κυφορούσης, ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαι ὅποτε βούλεται· Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ κοινωνεῖ ἡ τίκτουσα τῷ τικτομένῳ· διὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι.

‘A woman with child may be baptized when she pleases. For ‘the mother in this matter communicates nothing to the child: ‘because in the profession every one’s own [or peculiar] resolution ‘is declared [or because every one’s resolution at the profession is ‘declared to be peculiar to himself.]’

II. The argument of the antipædobaptists from this passage is, that both those that raised the doubt, and the council that resolved

<sup>f</sup> Gal. v. 19, 20.

<sup>g</sup> Rom. xvi. 17.

<sup>h</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

<sup>i</sup> Liberty of Propheying.

it, must have been of opinion that it is unlawful to baptize an infant.

For, say they, those men that scrupled the baptizing of a woman with child, scrupled it for this reason, because they thought that in so doing they baptized the child too; which to do had been no absurdity supposing the baptism of an infant to be lawful: it would have been only the doing of both under one.

And also the fathers of the council, say they, do seem to grant that the baptizing of the child would be unlawful: for they give that reason why they allow the baptizing of the woman, ‘because her baptism communicates nothing to the child.’

And besides, the fathers (as these men construe their words) do determine that in the baptismal profession every person must declare his own choice or resolution, which it is impossible for the infant in the womb, or any other infant to do.

III. The pædobaptists say, that this is a wide mistake of the meaning of those that raised the doubt, and of the council in resolving it. For that it was no more than this:

They that scrupled the baptizing of such a woman, scrupled it for this reason; because it would be a disputable case whether the child in her womb were to be accounted as baptized by its mother’s baptism or not: and so when that child was born, they should be in great perplexity whether they must baptize it or not. For if they did, there would be danger that it would be baptized twice: and if they did not, it was questionable whether it had any baptism at all. And that therefore it was better the woman should stay till she were delivered, and then she might be baptized for herself and the child for itself.

But the bishops in council (considering, as it is likely, the danger of the woman’s death in the meanwhile) determined otherwise; that she might be baptized if she would; and that there was no ground for the aforesaid scruple or perplexity about the child’s baptism, for that it was a plain case that the child is not to be accounted as baptized by its mother’s baptism; for that such a woman’s baptism reaches no further than herself, and is not communicated to the child in her womb; and give this reason; because ‘the profession that any one makes at baptism, declares *ἰδίαν προαίρεσιν*, a resolution [or desire to be baptized] that is peculiar to themselves:’ and so the woman in this case does not desire or demand the baptism at that time for her child, but for herself only.

IV. If the reader will please to turn back and read the words once again with any attention, he will see that they are, as to the main of

the determination, applicable to either of these senses. If the bishops had thought baptizing of infants unlawful, they would have determined this case much as they do, but it is no kind of proof that they did think so: because if they meant only to take away the perplexity about baptizing the child, when born, they must also determine it as they do.

But the learned reader will likewise observe that there is something in the propriety of the phrase in the last clause that does incline it to this latter sense; and that is the notation of the word *ἴδιος* which properly signifies any thing ‘peculiar to one’s self;’ and the repetition of the article *τὴν* before the words *ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ*.

If the bishops had meant to determine that the child could not be supposed to be baptized with its mother for this reason, because in baptismal profession every one must declare his own choice; and so an infant could not be baptized: they would have expressed that latter clause thus, *διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον δεῖν ἑαυτοῦ τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δεῖκνυναι*, ‘because every one must make his own choice at ‘the profession.’ But when they say, *διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δεῖκνυσθαι*, they do (as any critic will observe) express this sense; ‘because the choice which is made at the [baptismal] profession, is declared by every one peculiar to himself.’ And so it is only a reason of what they had said last; ‘that the ‘mother communicates nothing to the child:’ and not any reason against the baptizing of an infant.

V. Before I go farther, I esteem it very material to observe by the by this emphasis of the word *ἴδιος*, for apprehending the force of a text of St. Paul against the Polygamists. These men presume to say, that there is no prohibition in the New Testament of the plurality of wives to one man. St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 1, 2, persuades people, if they can be so content, to an absolute continence; but if they cannot, he allows marriage; but with this limitation, *ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχέτω, καὶ ἕκαστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἔχέτω*. The true translation of which words is, ‘Let every man have his own wife, and let every ‘woman have a husband peculiar to her.’

For as, when Aristotle says, *ἴδιον τοῦτο τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* it were a very imperfect rendering to translate it, ‘men have this of their ‘own:’ which ought to be, ‘This is proper or peculiar to men.’ And where he says *ὁ δὲ βάτραχος ἰδίαν ἔχει τὴν γλῶσσαν* to say, ‘Frogs make their own noise,’ would not reach the sense: which is, that ‘Frogs make a noise peculiar to themselves.’—So it is an imperfect translation of the foresaid words of the apostle, which our



English gives, *Let every woman have her own husband.* The word signifies, *one peculiar to her.*

VI. But to return to our business : Grotius, among the arguments with which he endeavours to uphold the cause of the antipædobaptists, produces two commentators on this canon, Balsamon and Zonaras, who (as he would represent their meaning) interpret it as if the council had understood infant-baptism to be unlawful. Grotius' words are these : 'How much soever the commentators draw it to another sense ; it is plain that the doubt concerning the baptizing women great with child, was for that reason, because the child might seem to be baptized together with its mother ; and a child was not wont to be baptized but upon its own will and profession.' And so Balsamon explains it, *Compend. Canon. tit. 4.* 'That cannot be enlightened [or baptized] because it is not yet come into the light, nor has any choice of the divine baptism.' And also Zonaras, 'The child that is now in the womb has need of baptism then when it shall be able to choose.'

Any one that reads this would conclude that Balsamon and Zonaras at least (if not the Neocæsarean fathers) were antipædobaptists : if he be one that does not understand that there are most full and evident records of the time in which these two men lived, (which was the twelfth century,) and that there was then no such thing as antipædobaptism in the Greek church, in which Balsamon was patriarch of Antioch.

VII. Rivet<sup>k</sup>, Marshall, &c., do accuse Grotius of partiality and foul dealing in general in his pleading the cause of the antipædobaptists, and particularly in this place. And though the opinion of Balsamon and Zonaras be not of that moment as to make it worth the while to repeat their words, (since they had at that distance no better opportunity of knowing the mind of the council than we now have,) yet I will set them down something at large, that the reader may see if he can acquit that great man of the crime of prevarication.

Balsamon's comment on that canon is this : 'Some had said, "that women which come over from the heathens to the church great with child ought not to be baptized, but to stay till they were delivered ; lest when the mother is baptized, the child in her womb do seem to be baptized too, as being altogether united to her : and

<sup>i</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.  
<sup>k</sup> [See 'Hugonis Grotii Annotata in Consultationem G. Cassandri, cum animadversionibus Andreæ Riveti :' this Treatise is contained in the third volume

of the 'Opera Theologica' of Rivetus, published at Rotterdam in 1651-60, p. 925—976. The particular passage here alluded to by Dr. Wall occurs at p. 941.]

‘ so when it is born it will either be left unbaptized, or if it be baptized it may be accounted to be twice baptized.” The fathers therefore, not allowing this contradiction, appointed that such women may be baptized without any scruple when they please: for that the woman has nothing common with the child in her womb in the concern of baptism: especially, say they, when as to every one in baptism his own promising is necessary. But the embryo [*ἐσπερημένον διαθέσεως*] having not the qualification [or disposition, or affection] cannot make the profession at baptism. And that clause, “when they please,” was added to the canon because of some that say, “Before the embryo be formed in a human creature, the woman may be baptized without scruple, but not conveniently afterward; because the child in her womb then is in the same case as infants newly born, which cannot make profession.” The fathers therefore said, that it is at the woman’s pleasure to be baptized when she will; because in what state the embryo is none can tell, nor be sponsor for it: but infants do promise by their sponsors, and being actually baptized have the heavenly illumination granted to them.’

And in his glosses upon Photius’ Nomocanon, tit. 4. c. 10, he says, ‘ There was a question made, whether a woman with child might be baptized: for some said, “Because the child in the womb is united to the mother as a part of her, and cannot be enlightened [or baptized] with the mother, because it is not yet come into the light, nor has any choice of the profession of the divine baptism; therefore the mother ought not to be baptized, but to stay till the child be born: lest one part of her be enlightened, and the other remain unenlightened. And if the child be baptized with the mother’s baptism, then, if it be baptized after it is born, it will prove to be twice baptized, which is absurd.” Therefore the synod of Neocæsarea resolve the doubt in their sixth canon,’ &c.

Zonaras’ words are these in his comment on the said canon: ‘ It determines that women with child may be baptized when they please. And whereas some affirmed, “that the fœtus is baptized together with the mother, and that therefore the infant when born must not be baptized, lest it should have a double baptism:” therefore were those words added, “for the mother in this matter communicates nothing to the child,” i. e. for the mother only and not the child is made partaker of holy baptism. Because, says he, for the profession of being joined to Christ the choice of every one is required. And by it is shewn whether he come to holy baptism with a willing mind. And because in the fœtus that is

‘ enclosed in the mother’s womb there is no choice, it is not to be accounted to have received baptism; and therefore it has need of baptism again when it shall be able to choose.’

These two commentators do indeed understand the last clause of the canon in that sense which I shewed even now not to be the true sense, nor according to the rules of critics. But yet it was not fair in Grotius to represent them as being themselves, or supposing the council to be, against infant baptism; since as it appears that they suppose every one’s choice to be necessary at baptism; so it likewise appears that an infant’s choice and promise made by its sponsors or godfathers is the choice and promise they speak of. Besides that he quoting scraps of sentences, produces as Balsamon’s own words that which Balsamon had brought in as pleaded by others; and also something altered, as the reader will see by comparing.

VIII. The issue of the dispute is; the council say in this matter, what any one, whether pædobaptist or antipædobaptist, would say; and therefore the proof that they were of one or of the other opinion must be taken from some other evidence: for these words make neither for the one nor the other. And since we are now come so low as within sixty years of the time of St. Austin, Pelagius, &c., and they, as I shall shew<sup>1</sup> presently, do declare that they never read or heard of any Christians that were against infant-baptism; it were a strange thing to suppose that there should have been a council so late as under the reign of Constantine (as this council was) and they never to have read or heard of it. No man can think but they had heard of this council, which was but a little before the time of their birth. It is plain therefore that they took the meaning of it not to have been against infant-baptism.

St. Austin sometimes speaks of this case of a woman baptized while great with child: and he does not only determine it as these bishops do, but he speaks of it as a clear case; perhaps because he knew it had been determined in this council. He takes occasion to mention it, lib. vi. *Contra Julianum*, c. 5, where he is shewing the weakness of that argument of the Pelagians, who said, that if original sin be the cause why infants are baptized, then the child that was born of Christian and baptized parents would not need to be baptized, as being born of those that were cleansed of that sin, and of a mother whose body was the temple of the Holy Spirit. He says among other things, this:

‘ That the mother’s body should be the temple of God is the

<sup>1</sup> Ch. xix. § 17, and 29, 30. &c. ad 40.



‘benefit of grace not of nature: which grace is conveyed not by birth, but by regeneration. For if that which is conceived in the mother’s body did belong to it, so as to be accounted a part of it, then an infant whose mother was, upon some danger of death, baptized while she was great with him, would not need to be baptized. But now when such an infant is baptized, he will not be accounted twice baptized. Therefore when he was in the womb of his mother, he did not appertain to it: and yet he was formed in a temple of God, but so as not to be himself the temple of God.’ And he has the same instance over again, c. 6.

IX. Some learned men have given their conjectures of the occasion of this doubt, viz. what should make some people of this country take up an opinion, that if a woman with child were baptized, her child when born would have no need of baptism: and they give a very probable account of it.<sup>1</sup> Several Jews were dispersed in these parts: and the rabbies of the Jews had this rule concerning the baptism of proselytes; ‘If a woman great with child become a proselyte, and be baptized; her child needs not baptism when it is born:’ as I shewed in the introduction.

---

## CHAP. IX

### *A Quotation out of Optatus Milevitanus.*

§ I. THIS bishop living in Africa had occasion to write several  
 260. books against the schism of the Donatists. Some part of  
 (A.D. 360.) the controversy between them and the catholics was about baptism: but not about infant-baptism, as a certain writer of small reading has mistaken the matter. It was whether baptism given by an ill minister were valid, or must be renewed? and whether the catholics were so corrupt a church, as that all baptized by them, whether in infancy or at age, must be baptized afresh by some such pure men as the Donatists were?

Otherwise the doctrine and practice of baptism was the same with both the parties.

This appears plainly by what this author says in way of persuading them to break off their schism: ‘The ecclesiastical management is one and the same with us and you. Though men’s minds are at variance, the sacraments are at none. And we may say, we believe alike, and are sealed with one and the same seal:’ no otherwise baptized than you, ‘nor otherwise ordained than you are. We read the scripture alike: we pray to the same God. The

<sup>1</sup> Hammond’s Six Queries, Inft. Bapt. § 109. Lightfoot’s Hor. Hebr. Matt. iii.



‘Lord’s Prayer is the same with us and you<sup>m</sup>,’ &c. The same thing is affirmed by St. Austin<sup>n</sup>. He owns their baptism, ordination, &c., to be rightly performed: he blames nothing in them but their separation. And by Cresconius the Donatist, who has these words to the catholics; ‘There is between us and you one religion, the same sacraments, nothing in the Christian ceremonies different. It is a schism that is between us, not a heresy<sup>o</sup>.’

II. But that which I mean to quote, and is all that he has occasion to say about infant-baptism, is this:

*Lib. quinto de Schismate Donatistarum, prope finem.* [cap. 10. p. 89.]

He had been there comparing a Christian’s putting on Christ in baptism, to the putting on of a garment, and had called Christ so put on, ‘*tunicam natantem in aquis*,’ ‘a garment swimming in the water.’ And then says,

‘Sed ne quis dicat, temere a me Filium Dei vestem esse dictum; legat apostolum dicentem; *Quotquot in nomine Christi baptizati estis, Christum induistis*. O tunica semper una, et innumerabilis<sup>p</sup>, quæ decenter vestiat et omnes ætates et formas: nec in infantibus rugatur, nec in juvenibus tenditur, nec in fæminis immutatur.’

‘But lest any one should say, I speak irreverently, in calling Christ a garment: let him read what the apostle says, *As many of you as have been baptized in the name of Christ have put on Christ*. Oh what a garment is this, that is always one and never renewed, that decently fits all ages and all shapes! It is neither too big for infants nor too little for men, and without any alteration fits women.’ He goes on to shew how it may be also compared to the wedding garment, &c. This needs no note.

## CHAP. X.

*A Quotation out of St. Gregory Nazianzen, concerning St. Basil’s Baptism in his Infancy.*

§ I. THIS quotation might have been placed thirty or forty years sooner, (at which time St. Basil must have been born,) because it recites a matter of fact done then. But I set it at this year, because this author that mentions it, began at this time to be a man of note in the church, (a presbyter and writer of books, &c.) though he preached the sermon that I shall cite about twenty years after.

<sup>m</sup> Lib. iii. de Schismate Donatist. prope finem.

<sup>n</sup> Epist. ad Theodorum Donatist.

<sup>o</sup> Apud Augustinum lib. ii. contra

Cresconium, c. 3.

<sup>p</sup> [N. B. Du Pin’s edition reads ‘*immutabilis*:’ but I have left the text as Dr. Wall gave and translated it.]

Some that have gone about to draw up a catalogue of persons not baptized in infancy, though born of Christian parents, have reckoned St. Basil among them: but the evidence they bring is out of spurious and forged authors, as I shall shew in its place. And in the mean time I shall produce the authority of a piece that all acknowledge to be genuine, which, I think, shews that he was baptized in infancy.

St. Gregory Nazianzen was contemporary with St. Basil, and so well acquainted with him, as that it is impossible any one should have been more: and though he seems to have been something the older man, yet he lived to preach a sermon in commendation of him, in the nature of a funeral sermon, though it was some time after his death.

In that sermon he recites several passages of his parentage, birth, life, and death: and among them, the passage, which I take to relate to his baptism, is penned in such a rhetorical and figurative periphrasis, that taking it by itself, one is not sure whether he means baptism by it or something else. But since the first reading of it, I have observed in another discourse of his, the very same description applied plainly and purposely to baptism: which, together with the probability that it carries in itself, convinces me (and I suppose will the reader, when he compares them) that it is so to be applied in that sermon concerning St. Basil.

I shall first give the words by which he describes baptism, in his  
*Oratio in Sanctum Baptisma*; Or. 40. § 2.<sup>r</sup>

Τρίσσην γέννησιν ἡμῖν οἶδεν ὁ λόγος, τὴν ἐκ σωμάτων, τὴν ἐκ βαπτίσματος, καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἀναστάσεως. Τούτων δὲ, ἡ μὲν νυκτερινή τέ ἐστι, καὶ δούλη, καὶ ἐμπαθής. Ἡ δὲ ἡμερινή, καὶ ἐλευθέρα, καὶ λυτικὴ παθῶν, πᾶν τὸ ἀπὸ γενέσεως κάλυμμα περιτέμνονσα, καὶ πρὸς τὴν αἰῶν ζῶν ἐπανάγουσα· ἡ δὲ φοβερωτέρα, καὶ συντομωτέρα, πᾶν τὸ πλάσμα συνάγουσα ἐν βραχεῖ, τῷ πλάσῃ παραστησόμενον.

‘Religion teaches us that there are three sorts of generation or formation: that of our bodies; that of baptism; and that of the resurrection. The first of these is of the night, and is servile, and tainted with lust. The second is of the day, and is free and powerful against lust, and takes away all that veil [or darkness] contracted in our birth [or generation], and renews us to the supernal life. The last is more dreadful and sudden, bringing together in a moment all the creation, to be set before their Creator.’

And a little after, among other titles that he gives to baptism,

he calls it *πλάσματος ἐπανόρθωσιν*, ‘the amendment [or rectifying] of our formation.’

All that I produce this here for, is to observe the phrase or description that he gives to baptism. He calls our natural generation, *nocturnal*, or of the night; but the baptismal generation, *diurnal*, or of the day. And Nicetas there observes, that the name is taken from those words of David, Psal. cxxxix. 16, where the translation of the Septuagint (which was in use with them) reads (much different from our English), ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον σου πάντες γραφήσονται ἡμέρας πλασθήσονται. ‘They shall all be written in thy book: they shall be formed by day.’

II. Now see what he says of St. Basil, *Funebr. Orat. in laudem Basilii*; Orat. 20. [ed. Benedict. 43. § 12.]

He had spoken of his progenitors, many of whom were martyrs for Christ, and of the piety of his father Basil, who, it seems, was a man in holy orders: and of his mother Emmelia: and making an end of that prefatory discourse, he says,

Φέρε τὰ κατ’ αὐτὸν θεωρήσωμεν. Τὰ μὲν δὴ πρῶτα τῆς ἡλικίας ὑπὸ τῷ μεγάλῳ πατρὶ, ὃν κοινὸν παιδευτὴν ἀρετῆς ὁ Πόντος τηρικαῦτα προβάλλετο, σπαργανοῦται καὶ διαπλάττεται πλάσιν τὴν ἀρίστην τὴν καὶ καθαρωτάτην, ἣν ἡμερινὴν ὁ Θεὸς Δάβιδ καλῶς ὀνομάζει, καὶ τῆς νυκτερινῆς ἀντίθετον.

‘Now let us contemplate the affairs that relate to him himself. ‘In the beginning then of his age he was by his excellent father, ‘who was at that time a public teacher of virtue in the country of ‘Pontus, swaddled, as I may call it, and formed with that best and ‘most pure formation, which divine David rightly names “of the ‘day,” and which is opposed to that of the night.’

Billius in his note on these words says, ‘he means the formation ‘of baptism, or rather of manners: which David calls “of the day,” ‘saying they shall be formed by day: for so it is to be read. Which ‘excellent formation is opposite to that of the night, which is by ‘copulation, and is sordid, and a work of darkness.’

But I believe Billius had not animadverted (what I here observe) that it is the very same phrase which he uses in the other sermon, for baptism. I also at the first reading thought it uncertain which he meant, baptism, or good education in manners: but the likeness of a phrase so singular seems to determine it. They of that time seem to have understood that verse of the psalm, as speaking before of the Christian baptism.

This formation appears to have been given in infancy, both by the words τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἡλικίας, ‘in the beginning of his age;’ and

also by the emphasis of the word *σπαργανοῦται*, which signifies the binding or first fashioning of the body of an infant in swaddling clothes; and also by the orderly method in which he proceeds: for he mentions in the next paragraph to this his childhood, in which he was educated at home, and ‘by the instructions that are first in ‘order and proper for a child, fitted for the perfection he was to ‘arrive at afterward,’ (therefore the foregoing paragraph must have referred to his infancy.) Then he proceeds to tell, that when he was a boy big enough, he was sent to school to Cæsarea, then to Byzantium, and then to the university of Athens: where it was that Gregory, who knew him before, (at Cæsarea I suppose,) entered, as he says, into that strict league of friendship with him which lasted during their joint lives: and in which they seemed, as he expresses it, to have ‘both but one soul informing two bodies.’ After this he relates how he went into orders, and came, in process of time, to be bishop of Cæsarea, and so famous a man as he was.

III. From this methodical enumerating all the material passages and actions of his life, arises another proof that he must have been baptized in infancy; and that the passage which I mentioned must be meant of that: because in all the passages of his life afterward he never mentions any thing of his baptism, which it had been impossible to omit if he had received it after any considerable time of his life had passed.

Also I do not see what else he can mean than St. Basil’s baptism in infancy, by another expression which he has in the same oration. He is comparing Basil to each of the patriarchs and holy men of the Old Testament, Abraham, Moses, &c., and he shews how he had something in his temper, and in the passages of his life, like to something in every one of theirs. Among the rest he compares him to Samuel, and says [§ 73],

Σαμουὴλ ἐν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ Θεῷ δοτὸς πρὸ γενέσεως, καὶ μετὰ τὴν γέννησιν εὐθὺς ἱερὸς, καὶ χρίων βασιλέας καὶ ἱερέας διὰ τοῦ κέρατος. Οὗτος δὲ, οὐκ ἐκ βρέφους Θεῷ καθιερωμένος ἀπὸ μήτρας, καὶ μετὰ τῆς διπλοῖδος ἐπιδομένος τῷ βήματι, καὶ βλέπων τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ Χριστὸς Κυρίου ἦν καὶ χρίστης τῶν τελειουμένων ἐκ πνεύματος;

‘Samuel among them that call upon his name, was both given ‘[or promised] before he was born, and presently after his birth ‘was consecrated, and he became an anointer of kings and priests, ‘out of a horn. And was not this man (Basil) consecrated to God ‘in his infancy from the womb, and carried to the steps [or font] ‘in a coat? Did he not become a seer of heavenly things, and an



‘anointed of the Lord, and an anointer of such as were initiated by the Spirit?’

The word *βῆμα* properly signifies *steps*. It is ordinarily taken for a *pulpit*, to which one goes up by steps: and it may signify a *font* or *baptistery*, to which they did go down by steps. But the coat in which he says Basil was offered to God (alluding to the child’s coat which was made for Samuel by his mother) cannot well be supposed to have been any thing but the albs used at baptism. And this, he says, was in his infancy.

The instance of Samuel dedicated in infancy, is one which this father does at other places make use of for a comparison or example of a Christian’s child baptized in infancy: as will be seen in the next chapter; where speaking to some tender mothers that were afraid, it seems, of putting their infants into the water at baptism, he says, ‘Thou art afraid as a fainthearted mother,’ &c. ‘But Hannah, before Samuel was born, devoted him to God: and when he was born, presently consecrated him, and brought him up in a priestly coat.’ The very thing that he says here of St. Basil’s parents.

---

## CHAP. XI.

### *Other Quotations out of St. Gregory Nazianzen concerning the Doctrine of Infant-Baptism.*

§ I. THIS father was not himself baptized in infancy: and if it be true that he was born after the time that his father was a Christian and in holy orders, (of which the antipædobaptists do give probable evidence,) he had the most reason of any one in those times to be prejudiced against the doctrine of the necessity of infant-baptism; which he could not urge himself, nor hear urged by others, without some reproach thereby cast on the conduct of his father, for whom he always expressed a great reverence; though other writers give him but a mean character, and shew that the son’s prudence<sup>s</sup> and skill was found necessary to retrieve the father’s credit and the esteem of the people, and to preserve him from being overwitted by the Arians, or frightened by their power.

So much is certain, that of all the instances brought by the antipædobaptists of men who being baptized Christians themselves, yet did not baptize their children in infancy, there is a better appearance of proof in this man’s father’s case than in any other. Of which instances I must treat more largely in a chapter<sup>t</sup> on purpose;

<sup>s</sup> Greg. Presbyter. in Vita Naz.

<sup>t</sup> Part ii. ch. 3.

and at present give account of what this author himself speaks of the doctrine of infant-baptism.

II. All that I have to produce is taken out of his sermon that I mentioned before ; viz. his

*Oratio de Baptismo, Or. 40.*

In which he both persuades those of his hearers, who had not yet so thoroughly embraced Christianity as to be baptized into it, that they would without delay be partakers of it, and also speaks something concerning the necessity of it to infants.

Of this oration I will give a short abstract, setting down the original of such passages only, as do, some way, affect the question in hand.

After some commendations of baptism, he proceeds [§ 4.] to mention the names or titles by which it is called, which are these : ‘ The gift, the grace, baptism or washing, the anointing, the laver ‘ of regeneration, the amending of our make,’ or formation, ‘ the ‘ seal :’ and explains the reason of these several appellations.

Then having spoken of man’s natural and original corruption, he says, ‘ God has not left his creature without a remedy ; but as he ‘ first made us, so he renews us by this divine formation :’ ἡ τοῖς μὲν ἀρχομένοις ἐστὶ σφραγίς, τοῖς δὲ τελειοτέροις τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ χάρισμα, καὶ τῆς πεσοῦσης εἰκόνης διὰ τὴν κακίαν ἐπανόρθωσις. ‘ which as it ‘ is a seal for such persons as newly enter into life ; so to those that ‘ are adult it is a grace, and the restoring of the image which they ‘ had lost.’ [§ 7.]

Then he says, the force and effect of baptism is, ‘ a covenant ‘ with God of a new and holy life :’ and argues from thence how careful we ought to be to keep it entire, ‘ and that,’ says he, οὐκ οὔσης δευτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως, ‘ because there is no regeneration to be ‘ had afterward.’ Yet he grants there is repentance afterward : but that leaves a scar, and requires a long time, and many tears ; which we know not whether God will give us a space for. (They, as I observed before, gave the name of regeneration to no other but the baptismal renewing.) [§ 8.]

Then he warns them of the tentations that they must expect after their baptism, and how they must oppose and overcome them. [§ 10.]

III. Against the delay of baptism, he minds them of the danger of missing it by sudden death : and how much more creditable and comfortable it is to receive it voluntarily in the time of health and strength, than in time of necessity on a sick bed, ‘ when the tongue ‘ falters, and can hardly utter the words of the holy initiation ; and

‘the washing’ is more like the washing of a corpse than religious ‘baptism.’ That a generous mind will desire not only the forgiveness of sins, but also the reward promised to virtuous actions, for which there must some time be allowed between baptism and death. [§ 11, 12.]

That there are three sorts of persons very different, though all of them may be saved; ‘the slave, the mercenary, and the son.’ The first minds no more than the escaping of punishment: the second regards nothing but the pay: the son’s mind is full of duty and love to his father. That all other good things we desire to enjoy as soon as may be: and so we ought to do this freedom from sin. [§ 13.]

That the Devil would indeed entice us to give him the present, and God the remainder; him the flower of our age, and God the dregs. But that we must consider the many hazards we are subject to: ‘the chance of war, an earthquake, the sea, a wild beast, a disease, a crumb of bread, a surfeit, a precipice, a horse, a medicine, a tyrant,’ &c. [§ 14.]

Then he answers the pretences which the half Christians of those times made for their delay. As, ‘I am afraid I shall not keep the grace of baptism unstained, and so will not take my cleansing yet, as having none to take afterward.—Oh crafty imposture,’ says he, ‘of the evil spirit! He is indeed darkness, yet he counterfeits light. When he does not prevail by open war, he lays his snares. When he cannot bring thee to despise baptism, he would cheat thee of it by overmuch caution,’ &c. ‘He sets on all ages, and must be resisted in all.’ [§ 16.] ‘Art thou a youth? fight against pleasures and passions with this auxiliary strength: list thyself in God’s army,’ &c.—‘Art thou old? let thy gray hairs hasten thee: strengthen thy old age with baptism,’ &c.—*Νήπιόν ἐστὶ σοι; μὴ λαβέτω καιρὸν ἢ κακία· ἐκ βρέφους ἁγιασθήτω, ἐξ ὀνύχων καθιερωθήτω πρὸ Πνεύματι. Σὺ δὲ δοικας τὴν σφραγίδα διὰ τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀσθενές; ὥς μικρόψυχος ἢ μήτηρ καὶ ὀλιγόπιστος. ἢ Ἄννα δὲ, καὶ πρὶν ἢ γεννηθῆναι τὸν Σαμουὴλ, καθυπέσχετο τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ γεννηθέντα ἱερὸν εὐθὺς ποιεῖ, καὶ τῇ ἱερατικῇ στολῇ συνανέθρεψεν, οὐ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον φοβηθεῖσα, τῷ δὲ Θεῷ πιστεύσασα.* [§ 17.]

‘Hast thou an infant-child? let not wickedness have the advantage of time: let him be sanctified from his infancy: let him be dedicated from his cradle to [or by] the Spirit. Thou, as a faint-hearted mother and of little faith, art afraid of giving him the seal because of the weakness of nature. Hannah, before Samuel was born, devoted him to God, and as soon as he was born, con-

‘separated him, and brought him up from the first in a priestly garment, not fearing for human infirmities, but trusting in God. Thou hast no need of amulets or charms; together with which the Devil slides into the minds of shallow persons, drawing to himself the veneration that is due to God. *Δὸς αὐτῷ τὴν τριάδα, τὸ μέγα καὶ καλὸν φυλακτήριον.* Give to him the Trinity, that great and ‘excellent preservative.’

He proceeds to stir up all persons in all estates and employments to receive baptism: only he would advise those that had places in court, to resign, and fly from Sodom, if conveniently they could, when they were baptized: (it is to be noted that Valens, a wicked and Arian emperor, reigned at that time.) If they could not conveniently, yet to be baptized; and preserve the purity thereof as well as they could in so ill a station: that God in judging of our lives makes allowance for the circumstances that we are in: ‘that for a man that is fettered to get forward a little, is as great praise as for another to run: for one that travels in a dirty road to be but a little bespattered, is more remarkable than for another to be clean.’ [§ 19.]

V. He next sets upon those men that put off their baptism to death or old age, for the love of their sinful pleasures which they were unwilling as yet to part with: who said, ‘Where is the advantage of taking baptism so soon, and thereby cutting one’s self off from all the worldly pleasures and delights? Whereas one may enjoy these pleasures in the mean while, and then be baptized at last. For they that went the earliest to labour in the vineyard sped no better than they that came in the latest.’

He answers; ‘You have saved me a great deal of trouble by your making this plea: for you have at last with much ado discovered the very secret of this delay. And though I dislike your wicked purpose; yet I commend you for one thing, that you own it without disguise.

‘Come on then, and give the sense of this parable: and be not ignorantly scandalized [or drawn into sin] by this place of scripture.

‘First, this is not meant of baptism, but of those who come, some sooner, some later, to the faith, [or the knowledge of Christian religion,] and enter the vineyard, the church: for every one must labour from that day and hour on which he comes to the faith,’ &c.

‘Besides, supposing by entering the vineyard baptism be meant, the parable shews that those that do at all enter the vineyard and



‘labour, shall have a reward. But you are in danger to miss of doing that. If you were sure that notwithstanding this wicked contrivance to avoid labouring, you should at last obtain baptism; you might be pardoned in this sordid cunning: but since there is danger, that while you take this advantage, you will quite miss of the vineyard, &c., take my counsel, lay aside these subtleties, and come with an honest mind to baptism; lest you be taken out of this life before you attain your purpose, and be found to have devised these fallacies to your own destruction.’ [§ 20, 21.]

But you will say, ‘Is not God merciful enough to take in such a case the desire of baptism for baptism?’

VI. ‘You would have us believe a monstrous thing, if you think that God, because he is merciful, will count him enlightened that is not; and take him into the kingdom of heaven that wishes for it, but does not perform the things that make the way to it. I will tell you what is my opinion of this matter; in which, I believe, considering men will agree with me.’ [§ 22.]

‘As there are several sorts of those who do obtain the gift of baptism: Some were before extremely wicked,’ &c. ‘Others,’ &c. — ‘So it is likewise in those who miss of baptism. For some of them live like beasts and regard not baptism,’ &c. ‘Some have a value for baptism, but delay the receiving of it, either out of negligence, or δι’ ἀπληστίας out of greediness longer to enjoy their lusts: Οἱ δὲ οὐδὲ εἰσὶν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ δέξασθαι, ἢ διὰ νηπιότητα τυχόν, ἢ τινα τελέως ἀκούσιον περιπέτειαν, ἐξ ἧς οὐδὲ βουλομένοις αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχει τυχεῖν τοῦ χαρίσματος. But some others have it not in their own power to receive it, either because of their infancy perhaps, or by reason of some accident utterly involuntary; so that though they desire it, they have no opportunity to obtain the gift. As therefore we found much difference among those [that do obtain baptism], so there is among these [that miss of it].

‘They that wholly scorn it are worse than the negligent or those that crave longer time. But these are worse than those who fail of the gift, ἐξ ἀγνοίας καὶ τυραννίδος, by ignorance or constraint: τυραννὶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄλλό τι ἢ ἀκούσιος διαμαρτία, for constraint is no other thing than to miss against one’s will.

‘And I think of the first sort, that they shall be punished, as for their other wickedness, so for their slighting of baptism. And that the second shall be punished, but in a less degree, because they are guilty of their own missing it, but rather through folly than malice. Τοὺς δὲ μητὲ δοξασθήσεσθαι μητὲ κολασθήσεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δικαίου κριτοῦ, ὡς ἀσφραγίστους μὲν, ἀπονήρους δὲ, ἀλλὰ παθόντας

‘*μᾶλλον τὴν ζημίαν ἢ δρασάνας*: but that the last sort will neither be glorified nor punished by the just Judge; as being without the seal, but not through their own wickedness; and as having suffered the loss rather than occasioned it.

‘For he that is not worthy of punishment is not therefore presently worthy of honour; as he that is not worthy of honour does not therefore deserve punishment.

‘And I think thus also: If you would condemn for murder a man that has not murdered, merely because he had a mind so to do; then let him go with you for a baptized person, who had a mind to it, but had it not. But if that be absurd, I do not see how this can be reasonable.

‘Or if you please, take it thus: If to obtain the effect of baptism you think it sufficient that you desired baptism, and thereupon claim the glory of heaven; let the desire of that glory suffice you instead of the glory itself: for what matter is it if you go without it, so long as you have the desire of it.’ [§ 23.]

He next blames those that pretended they would stay till Epiphany or Easter or Whitsuntide, and then be baptized. ‘What will come of this?’ says he, ‘the end of your life will come on a sudden, in a day and hour that you think not of,’ &c. [§ 24.]

Those that would stay for the presence of their friends and relations, or till they had got ready an offering for the church, or a present for the baptizer, or a handsome white garment, or provision for a treat, he chides in these words: ‘These things I warrant you are mighty necessary, and the grace of baptism will be never the less for want of these. In things of great consequence do not stand upon trifling matters. This sacrament is of higher concern,’ &c. ‘For an offering, give yourself. Put on Christ. Treat me with your commendable life. God values nothing but those things which the poor have to give as well as the rich,’ &c. [§ 25.]

It is in like manner that he reproves such as stood on height and punctilios, that would have a bishop, or a metropolitan, or the bishop of Jerusalem, or (if it were a priest) one that led an unmarried life, for their baptizer: or that scorned to be baptized together with a poor man, or counted the length of the service too tedious.

He tells them the most acceptable posture or preparation to receive it, is a heart inflamed with the desire of it; that God takes that for a kindness, if we be earnestly desirous of his kindnesses: he takes more pleasure in giving than others in receiving, &c. [§ 26, 27.]

VII. He concludes that paragraph with saying, ‘We must there-

‘fore make it our utmost care that we do not miss of the common ‘grace:’ and then follow these words, Ἔστω ταῦτα, φησὶ, περὶ τῶν ἐπιζητούντων τὸ βάπτισμα· τὶ δ’ ἂν εἴποις περὶ τῶν ἔτι νηπίων, καὶ μήτε τῆς ζημίας ἐπαιθανομένων, μήτε τῆς χάριτος; ἢ καὶ ταῦτα βαπτίσομεν; πάννυγε, εἴπερ τις ἐπείγοι κίνδυνος. Κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἀναισθήτως ἁγιασθῆναι, ἢ ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα· καὶ τούτου λόγος ἡμῖν ἡ ὀκταήμερος περιτομή, τυπικὴ τις οὖσα σφραγίς, καὶ ἀλογίστοις ἔτι προσ-αγομένη· ὥς δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν φλιῶν χρίσις, διὰ τῶν ἀναισθήτων φυλάττουσα τὰ πρωτότοκα. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων δίδωμι γνώμην, τὴν τριετίαν ἀναμείναντας, ἢ μικρὸν ἐντὸς τούτου, ἢ ὑπὲρ τοῦτο, ἡνῖκα καὶ ἀκοῦσαι τι μυστικὸν καὶ ἀποκρίνεσθαι δύνατον, εἰ καὶ μὴ συνιέντα τελέως ἀλλ’ οὖν τυπούμενα, οὕτως ἁγιάζειν καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα τῷ μεγάλῳ μυστηρίῳ τῆς τελειώσεως. ‘Some may say, Suppose this to hold in the case of ‘those that can desire baptism: What say you to those that are as ‘yet infants, and are not in capacity to be sensible either of the ‘grace or the miss of it? Shall we baptize them too? Yes, by all ‘means, if any danger make it requisite. For it is better that they ‘be sanctified without their own sense of it, than that they should ‘die *unsealed and uninitiated*. And a ground of this to us is circum-  
‘cision, which was given on the eighth day, and was a typical seal  
‘[or baptism] and was practised on those that had no use of reason: ‘as also the anointing of the doorposts, which preserved the first-  
‘born by things that have no sense. As for others, I give my  
‘opinion that they should stay three years or thereabouts, when  
‘they are capable to hear and answer some of the holy words: and  
‘though they do not perfectly understand them, yet they form  
‘them: and that you then sanctify them in soul and body with the  
‘great sacrament of initiation. For though they are not liable to  
‘give account of their life before their reason be come to maturity,  
‘(they having this advantage by their age, that they are not forced  
‘to account for the faults they have committed in ignorance,)’ τετει-  
χίσθαι δὲ τῷ λουτρῷ παντὶ λόγῳ λυσιτελέστερον, διὰ τὰς ἐξαίφνης συμ-  
πιπτούσας ἡμῖν προσβολὰς τῶν κινδύνων, καὶ βοηθείας ἰσχυροτέρας, ‘yet  
‘by reason of those sudden and unexpected assaults of dangers that  
‘are by no endeavour to be prevented, it is by all means advisable  
‘that they be secured by the laver [of baptism].’ [§ 28.]

Then he answers the objection or pretence which some made from our Saviour’s being thirty years old before he was baptized; shewing the disparity in a great many particulars: one is this, that there was no danger in his delaying, who needed no purgation; and besides had the time of his death as well as of his birth at his own disposal. ‘But to you,’ says he, ‘there is a great deal of



‘danger, if you should depart this life, having been begotten in ‘corruption, and not being clothed with incorruption and immortality.’ [§ 29.]

VIII. The rest of the sermon is spent, partly in teaching them how to prepare themselves, viz. by fasting, watching, prayer, alms-deeds, restitution of goods illgotten in the time of their heathenism, (for, he says, though in baptism they are pardoned all past sins, yet he that keeps in his hands, after baptism, any thing that is in justice due to another, continues in the sin; to keep it is a present sin, though the act of stealing it be a past one,) and partly, in charging on their consciences the necessity of keeping their baptismal vow, when they have made it: in shewing the wretched estate from which they are delivered, the happy one into which they are going to be entered, and the dreadful one into which they will fall if they revolt [§ 30—40.]: and partly, in explaining the creed and faith into which they are baptized; where he especially insists on the belief of the holy Trinity (for these were times in which the Arian heresy was rife): of which having spoken largely, and answered the charge of tritheism cast on the catholics, and other objections of the Arians, he declares he will baptize none of them that do not own this faith. ‘And if you do still halt,’ says he, ‘and do not ‘own the divinity full and perfect; seek for somebody else to baptize [or dip] you, or rather drown [or destroy] you: for I have ‘no mind to divide the Deity, and at the time of your new birth ‘to bring death on you: so that you will have neither baptism nor ‘the hope of the grace, your salvation being quickly shipwrecked. ‘For if you deny divinity to any of these three, you overthrow the ‘whole [Trinity], and make your baptism of no force [or benefit] ‘to you.’ [§ 41—44.]

He concludes with giving the meaning of some ceremonies then used at baptism: particularly of the lamps they lighted and held in their hands, denoting those of the wise virgins that were prepared to meet their Lord: of which parable he makes a goodly application to them. [§ 46.]

IX. Among the things that we are to observe from this oration, this ought to be one:

1. The strange mistake that Grotius made when he went<sup>u</sup> about to disprove the ancient practice of infant baptism from this very sermon, in which there is nothing more or otherwise said of that matter than I have recited. He takes a few words out of this discourse, and even out of one of the passages here<sup>x</sup> recited, where

<sup>u</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

<sup>x</sup> Supra, § 6.



Gregory speaks of some, οἳ οὐδὲ εἰσὶν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ δέξασθαι, διὰ νηπιότητα τυχόν, ἢ τινα τελέως ἀκούσιον περιπέττειαν, ‘who have not ‘the receiving of baptism in their own power, either for their infancy ‘perhaps, or by reason of some accident utterly involuntary,’ of whom it is said a little after, that they lose the kingdom of heaven by so dying unbaptized, but yet escape punishment, because it was not their fault. He takes out of these words, the words διὰ νηπιότητα by themselves, and makes this use of them; that Gregory mentioning some ‘that are not baptized’ διὰ νηπιότητα ‘by reason ‘of their infancy,’ imports that infants were not wont to be baptized. Whereas it imports only, that an infant, if he have nobody to help him to it, is incapable of having baptism.

X. 2. It appears most evidently by the tenor of this sermon, that Nazianzen held concerning baptism these tenets:

1. That all who died unbaptized, by their own fault or negligence, were condemned.

2. He thought that infants dying unbaptized, and adult persons who missed of baptism by some unavoidable impediment, and not by their own fault, were in a kind of middle state between happiness and torment. But that baptized infants were partakers of the kingdom of heaven.

3. Where there is no danger of an infant’s death, he has a particular opinion (which he accordingly expresses<sup>y</sup>) thus, δίδωμι γνώμην, (I give my opinion,) that his baptism should be delayed till he is three years old: which would please neither the pædobaptist nor antipædobaptist.

He seems to have taken up this opinion in some degree of compliance with his father’s practice, who probably had kept him unbaptized so long purposely, and then seeing no danger of death, delayed it farther from time to time.

This man and Tertullian are the only two that speak of delaying it at all: one, till the age of reason; the other, till three years. Both one and the other are to be understood, where there is no danger of death in the mean while: which is plainly expressed<sup>z</sup> here, and in Tertullian is collected from his other speeches.

XI. 3. He uses three or four times in this oration (as he does also frequently in his other works) the word ἀγιασθῆναι ‘to be sanctified,’ [or made holy,] for baptism. And so did St. Cyprian in his words before cited<sup>a</sup>, and other places: and so do the ancients generally. Mr. Walker<sup>b</sup> has taken the pains to produce quotations

<sup>y</sup> Supra, § 7.

<sup>z</sup> § 7.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. vi. § 1.

<sup>b</sup> Modest Plea for Infant Baptism, ch. 29.

out of almost all the ancient writers to shew that this was a common phrase with them, to say, an infant or other person *sanctified*, when they mean baptized: and I do, for brevity's sake, refer the reader to his book. The scripture also uses it so, 1 Cor. vi. 11, Eph. v. 26.

Which makes that explication of 1 Cor. vii. 14, 'Now are your 'children holy,' which is given by Tertullian, St. Austin, St. Hierome, Paulinus, Pelagius<sup>c</sup>, and other ancients; and since by Dr. Hammond<sup>d</sup>, Mr. Walkere<sup>e</sup>, &c., much the more probable, whereby they make the words *ἁγία* 'holy,' and *ἡγίασται* 'has been sanctified,' to refer to baptism.

And their explication is also the more probable, because there has no other sense of those words been yet given by expositors but what is liable to much contest: but especially that sense, which some antipædobaptists have endeavoured to affix to them, (of legitimacy in opposition to bastardy,) seems the most forced and far-fetched of all. The words are, *ἡγίασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀνδρί. ἐπεὶ ἅρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι, νῦν δὲ ἁγιά ἐστιν.* The grammatical translation of which words is, 'for the unbelieving husband [or an unbelieving husband] 'has been sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife [or an 'unbelieving wife] has been sanctified by the husband. Else your 'children would be unclean: but now they are holy [or saints].' Our translators altered the tense, and put it 'is sanctified' instead of 'has been sanctified,' because they thought, it seems, the sense required it: but without any such alteration the paraphrase given by many learned men is to this purpose:

For it has ordinarily come to pass, that an unbelieving husband has been brought to the faith, and so to baptism, by his wife: and likewise an unbelieving wife by her husband. If it were not so; and if the wickedness or infidelity of the unbelieving party did usually prevail, the children of such would be generally kept unbaptized, and so be unclean. But now we see, by the grace of God, a contrary effect, for they are generally baptized, and so become holy, or sanctified.

If the reader will turn back to ch. 4. § 12, and also compare the quotations I shall produce in ch. 15. § 2, and ch. 18. § 4, and ch. 19. § 19, of this book, he will see that St. Austin's and Pelagius' comment on those words of the apostle is exactly to this purpose: and that Tertullian differs from them only in this, that he expounds the holiness that such children have by the prerogative of their

<sup>c</sup> See ch. xix. § 19.

<sup>d</sup> Six Queries.

<sup>e</sup> Modest Plea.

birth, by these words, *sanctitati designati*, ‘designed for holiness,’ because he reckons and proves from scripture, that they cannot be actually holy till they are actually baptized: and that St. Hierome and Paulinus speak to the same effect.

The word *ἅγιοι* in the New Testament is translated sometimes *saints*, sometimes *holy* persons; and was in the same use with them as the word *Christians* is with us.

There are two things, beside what I have mentioned, that do make this sense the more natural to that place. One is, that it appears by the apostle’s other words in the context, that this was his scope of arguing. *For what knowest thou, O wife*, says he, *whether thou shalt save thy husband?* i. e. by bringing him over to the faith: *Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?* This is a very different aim from what he would have, if he meant only that an unbelieving wife is sanctified to a believer for the use of the bed, as unclean meats are to a faithful eater.

Another is, that the custom of the Jewish language had made it ordinary before the apostles’ time to use the word *to sanctify* for baptizing or washing. Where God commands Moses at the giving of the law, Exod. xix. 10, *Sanctify them to-day and to-morrow*; all the learned Jews understand it, that he bid him baptize, i. e. wash them. And they prove from this place that Israel entered into covenant by baptism as well as circumcision. Most of the orders to the priests and Levites to sanctify themselves, are explained by washing themselves. Where it is said, Lev. vi. 27, *Whatsoever shall touch the flesh of the sin offering shall be holy*, the original word is, *shall be sanctified*: that is, (as the following verses shew,) shall be washed. In 2 Sam. xi. 4, it is said, *Bathsheba was purified* (in the original *was sanctified*) *from her uncleanness*: and this was done by washing. The *divers washings* among the Jews, mentioned Heb. ix. 10, (where it is in the original, *divers baptisms*,) are frequently styled by the Jews in their writings, *sanctifications*: as the priest’s washing his hands and feet ten times on the day of atonement, is called by them *the ten sanctifications*. This is so fully cleared by Ainsworth, Lightfoot, Hammond, &c., that there need no more be said of it.

St. Austin in his Questions on Leviticus has this inquiry; how it is meant that Moses should *sanctify the high priest*, Lev. xxi. 8, when God says, ver. 15, *I the Lord do sanctify him*<sup>f</sup>? In answer to which he distinguishes between the visible sanctification and the invisible: and after some discourse that the invisible is the chief, but yet that the other is not to be neglected, says, ‘Hence Corne-

<sup>f</sup> Quæst. 84.



‘lius, and they that were with him, when they appeared to be ‘already sanctified invisibly by the Holy Ghost coming on them, ‘were for all that baptized: nor was the visible sanctification ‘counted needless because the invisible was before.’

St. Paul inscribes his Epistles sent to the Christians of any place, thus, τοῖς ἁγίοις ‘to the holy persons;’ or thus, τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις ‘to ‘such as have been sanctified’ at such or such a place. And so the inscription of his letter to the Corinthian Christians in these words, *Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις: to them that are sanctified* [or have been sanctified] *in Christ Jesus, called to be saints*: it is but a larger periphrasis of what one would have said; *to all that are Christians there.* And St. Chrysostom<sup>h</sup> in his comment on these very words puts the question, τί δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἁγιασμός; ‘What is the sanctification he ‘speaks of?’ and answers readily, τὸ λουτρὸν, ὁ καθαρισμός, ‘the ‘laver,’ their baptism, ‘their cleansing.’

The ancient church likewise that compiled the Apostles’ Creed, when they would declare it as an article of Christian religion, that all Christians ought to hold communion with one another, express that article thus, ‘The communion’ τῶν ἁγίων ‘of saints.’

Therefore when St. Paul in this place uses the very same word, and says, *else your children would be unclean; but now they are ἅγια*, (which word is rendered in English sometimes *saints*, sometimes *holy*,) it is not at all alien to his ordinary use of the word to understand it, *else your children would be kept unbaptized, unsanctified, unchristian, unholy, or unclean: but now they are generally sanctified by baptism, and become holy or Christians.* If we had lived in the times of the ancients, when the word *sanctified* was used in common speech for baptized, this would have seemed a natural interpretation.

This exposition, as it avoids on one side the inconveniency of that given by the antipædobaptists, which takes the word *holy* and *unclean* in a sense in which they are never used in scripture: so it is likewise free from the exceptions which lie against that which limits the baptism of children so absolutely to that condition of their being born of believing parents; that it leads the baptizer into many perplexing scruples, whose children he may baptize, and whose not. As the late bishop of Worcester<sup>i</sup> has largely shewn.

4. What St. Gregory here says in the last place, that he will

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. i. 2.

<sup>h</sup> [Homil. i. in Epist. i. ad Corinthios, § 1. tom. x. edit. Montfaucon.]

<sup>i</sup> Bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Unreasonableness of Separation*, part iii. § 36.



baptize no Arian, nor any that disown the Godhead of Christ, and the Trinity, is according to the general sense of the catholics of that, and of the foregoing times. They would not hold communion with the Arians, and consequently would not by baptism enter such as members into their church. The greatest persecutions that the catholics at any time suffered were on this account. For the Arian emperors seldom went so far as to force the bishops to renounce the catholic faith and turn Arians: but they would banish them, unless they would receive the Arians to communion, or join with them. It was upon this account that Athanasius (who flourished from the beginning to almost the end of the Arian controversy) did so often suffer exile; because he would not admit Arius or his followers to communion, when it was desired by Constantine (who sought herein the quietness of his own government) and the other emperors that were themselves Arians.

These ancients reckoned that Christians might and ought to hold communion notwithstanding difference of opinions in lesser matters: but that this was a fundamental one, as relating to that which is the direct object of our worship.

The Arians for this reason made a great many attempts to express their faith in such ambiguous terms as might seem to agree with the catholic sense. It is a wonder to see in Socrates<sup>k</sup> (A.D. 359.) and other church historians, how many creeds were set forth for this purpose as schemes of agreement between the two parties. Some of these served in some churches to patch up for a while an unsound union; which was broken to pieces again as soon as each party expressed their meaning in other words. And it was found at last by a long trial that there was no firm agreement to be had but by owning the terms of the Nicene Creed. Mr. le Clerc observes somewhere, that the major part of the councils in those times, and of the creeds drawn up in them, were on the Arian side. Nobody need envy them this advantage: for we are not for a number of creeds. The catholics adhered to the Nicene, and were for having no more than that: it was the Arian party, which not agreeing among themselves, multiplied several draughts of faith. The Nicene Creed was at last found to be the only test to distinguish a catholic from an Arian.

XII. This I observe on account of some modern Arians, or rather they are to be called Photinians; for they have much more dishonourable opinions of our Saviour Christ than the Arians had, and

<sup>k</sup> Hist. lib. ii.

are more in the sentiments of Photinus, who was in the Arian times condemned<sup>1</sup> both by the catholics and the Arians.

There are of them both among the pædobaptists and the antipædobaptists: whether the antipædobaptists that believe in the Trinity, do baptize and receive into communion any such, or not, I am not sure. It is not likely that they who do separate from one another for far lesser differences, will dispense with so great an one about the divinity of Christ.

But those antitrinitarians, that are pædobaptists, in England, have of late, on a sudden, declared themselves to be at unity with the catholic church: yet the account which they give of their conversion to a good opinion of the catholic faith, is the oddest one that was ever given in so serious a matter. One does not know whether they are in earnest, or whether they mock in speaking of that awful mystery. About the year 1697 they published a paper<sup>m</sup> which they called ‘The Agreement of the Unitarians with the ‘Catholic Church:’ drawn up by themselves, and whether approved by any other I know not. In a book<sup>n</sup> published next year, which gives an account of the life of Thomas Firmin, and of his religion, they recite the said agreement, and discourse something more on the subject-matter of it. In the account of his religion, after having observed that the people had once thought that the difference between the Unitarians and the catholic church was ‘real, great, and ‘even unreconcilable,’ they add;

‘But the English Unitarians (or Socinians) being men of ingenious and free minds and principles, and therefore always ready ‘to entertain farther light; after eight or nine years late contest in ‘print with the principal divines of this nation, they have been so ‘dexterous and happy, that instead of farther embroiling the points ‘in question, which is the usual effect of the paper war, they seem ‘to have accommodated whatsoever differences depending between ‘the church and them.’

And a little after: ‘Other sects, by the favour of princes, or the ‘quality of the times, have obtained an exemption from mulets and ‘penalties of the laws, &c.—If Socinianism had any where enjoyed those halcyon days, its sudden irresistible progress would

<sup>1</sup> Socrat. lib. ii. cap. 29.

<sup>m</sup> [The Agreement of the Unitarians with the Catholic Church. Being also a full Answer to the Infamations of Mr. Edwards; and the needless Exceptions of my Lords the Bishops of Chichester, Worcester, and Sarum, and of Monsieur de Luzancy. 4to. (no place) 1698. In two

parts, pp. 64.]

<sup>n</sup> [‘The Life of Mr. Thomas Firmin, ‘late Citizen of London; with a Sermon ‘on the Occasion of his Death. Together ‘with an Account of his Religion, and ‘of the present State of the Unitarian ‘Controversy.’ 8vo. London, 1698.]

<sup>o</sup> Page 5.

‘ have been—as lightning, *that rusheth out of the east and shineth even to the west.* Alas! on equal ground, and with equal circumstances, the combat between unintelligible mystery and clear reason; between seeming contradictions, absurdities, and impossibilities; and a rational, obvious, accountable faith, would soon have been ended. But it is better ended: the Divine Providence and goodness, in mercy to both parties, has granted a peace instead of a victory. It has pleased God to favour the suffering side with an unexpected light: he has shewn them (what may seem incredible) that their opposers think as they [the Unitarians] speak, that their difference is not in the ideas or notions, but only in the terms or words. To manifest this, Mr. Firmin caused the following scheme of agreement,’ &c.

And to this purpose in the other treatise of the said book, viz. in the Life of Mr. Firmin, they say,

‘ The Unitarians never intended to oppose any other trinity, but a trinity of infinite minds or spirits. Grant to them that God is one infinite spirit or mind, not two or three, they demand no more. They applied themselves therefore to inquire, which of these trinities, a trinity of spirits, or of properties, is the doctrine of the catholic church. They could not miss of a ready satisfaction: all systems, catechisms, books of controversy, councils, writers, that have been esteemed catholic,——have defined God to be one infinite, all-perfect Spirit: and the divine Persons to be nothing else but the divine Essence or Godhead, with the three relative properties, unbegotten, and begotten, and proceeding.’

It is a wonder then that these men could never perceive this before. Had they never looked into any system, catechism, council, &c., before the year 1697? they say themselves, that as soon as they set themselves to inquire, they could not miss of a ready satisfaction.

But since they do now make a proposal of coming into the communion of the church, it is not so material to inquire what was the occasion of their quarrel, as it is to know whether their return to the church be cordial; and whether they are as yet of such a faith, as that, according to this rule of St. Gregory, they ought to be admitted to baptism (those of them that are not yet baptized) or to the communion.

XIII. 1. And if they would be received as cordially joining with the catholics; why do they still speak of the divinity of Christ in so ambiguous terms as becomes not such as have lain under censure



of false doctrine in that point? They repeat out of their scheme ; ‘ We say our Lord Christ is God and man. He is man, in respect ‘ of his reasonable soul and human body ; God, in respect of *God in him* : or more scholastically, in respect of the hypostatical or personal union, of the humanity of Christ with the divinity. By ‘ which the catholic church means, and we mean, the divinity was ‘ not only occasionally assisting to, but was and is always in Christ, ‘ illuminating, conducting, and actuating him<sup>q</sup>.’

And again, ‘ Nor do we reckon of the Lord Christ as but a creature ; I have said before, he is God and man. The Divinity did ‘ so *inhabit* in the humanity of Christ, doth so exert in it the most ‘ glorious effects of Omnipotence and Omniscience, that if others ‘ have been called God because they *represented* God, Christ is to be ‘ so called because he *exhibits* God<sup>r</sup>.’

All this, except what they say of the personal union, is lame still. For another man, as for example Moses, or any prophet that had the Spirit of God in him, illuminating, conducting, and enabling him to work miracles, &c., might be said to *exhibit* God in this sense ; only not in so high a degree, or not always.

What they subscribe to of the hypostatical or personal union would indeed be firm, and for ever stop their way against returning to Socinianism, if they had expressed it scholastically as they pretend to do. I mean, if they had said this union to be of the humanity of Christ with the *λόγος* or second of the three Persons. But when they say, ‘ with the Divinity,’ they either do not understand the import of that phrase, of hypostatical or personal union ; or else they purposely confound the notion. They do not mean sure, that the humanity of Christ is personally united to, or makes one person with, the Father.

<sup>160.</sup> The very doctrine for which both Paulus Samosatenus (A. D. 260.) and Photinus were condemned by the church, was, that <sup>244.</sup> they made Christ to be God only by the inhabitation of God in him : as bishop Stillingfleet<sup>s</sup> had fully proved to them. And yet, if you mind these men’s phrases, they own no more : and even the hypostatical union they explain to mean no more, and do without any modesty say, that the church means no more by it.

XIV. The truth is, the Socinians have very lately made a great and monstrous change in their doctrine : and yet hold their main article still ; that Christ has, properly speaking, no nature but the human. And these English Unitarians do by their way of explain-

<sup>q</sup> Account of Firmin’s Religion, p. 18.

<sup>r</sup> Page 30.

<sup>s</sup> Vindication of the Trinity, c. 4.



ing themselves give ground to suspect that they are still in that sentiment. They were wont formerly to degrade that λόγος of which St. John speaks, as much as they could; making it to be nothing but the human nature of Jesus Christ, or something belonging to the human nature. They did use to expound thus; *In the beginning was the word*: i. e. In the beginning of the Gospel, Jesus Christ and his preaching was. *And the word was with God*: i. e. He and his preaching were appointed in the council of God. *And the word was God*: i. e. He was God's deputy to men. *All things were made by him*: i. e. All matters of the Gospel dispensation were done by him, &c.

But now of late they put a notion on the term λόγος which carries the utmost degree of contrariety to their former interpretation. They make the λόγος to be not at all distinct from God the Father, neither in nature nor in person: but to be his attribute of wisdom, reason, &c. Thus a certain writer over the water, whose works they greedily translate into English<sup>t</sup>:

*In the beginning was the word*: i. e. In the beginning was reason.

*And the word was with God*: i. e. And that reason was with God.

*And the word was God*: i. e. And God was that reason.

*The same was in the beginning with God*: i. e. There was, I say, reason in God before the world was created.

Are not these great apophthegms for St. John to say?

And in the following verses, wherever we read *he* or *him*, they translate *it*. *All things were made by it*: and *without it was not any thing* &c. And then ver. 14, *And the word was made flesh*: i. e. And this reason, by the man in whom it was, was made conspicuous.

And where the author to the Hebrews having expressly named God's son, *whom he hath appointed heir of all things*, adds these words; *by whom also he made the worlds*: because here is no possible turning *him* into *it*, the paraphrase is; 'that is, having heretofore 'by that λόγος, or reason, or eternal wisdom which resided in Jesus, 'and was most nearly united to him, created all things.' If by 'most nearly united' be meant so united as to become one person, it is catholic. But the terms of residing in him, and of being made conspicuous by him, express a more lax sort of union than what the words of scripture do every where set forth. And at such a rate of interpreting it might be said of any mere man, in whom the Spirit of God does reside, that *the world was made by him*: because he has in him that Spirit by which it was made. But the scripture is far

<sup>t</sup> [See a Supplement to Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase and Annotations on the New

Testament: by Monsieur Le Clerc, 4to. London, 1690. p. 157, &c.]

from saying so of any mere man; and of our Lord Jesus Christ it never speaks otherwise than so: *By him were all things created: and, He is before all things*<sup>u</sup>. *Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all*<sup>x</sup>, &c. *With the glory which I had with thee before the world was*<sup>y</sup>. *I came forth from the Father. Before Abraham was, I am*<sup>z</sup> [or was], &c. It is not said, the Spirit or wisdom which is in me, came forth from the Father, or had glory with thee: but *I came forth, I had glory, &c.* And as far as the personal word *I* or *He* can denote the same person, it is here and every where else denoted.

The Paulianists and Photinians would say, as these men do, that Christ is God and man: but if they were asked whether he was God first, or man first, they would say, he was man first, and afterwards God, by God's dwelling in him. And these men seem to mean no other. But the catholic church believes that he was God first, and afterward became man. As St. John tells first what he was originally: and then how he was made flesh.

Cerinthus, who was St. John's chief adversary, and against whom he had a particular eye when he wrote his Gospel, (as both Irenæus<sup>a</sup> and St. Hierome<sup>b</sup> do witness,) taught that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary in like manner as all other men: and that he was eminent for justice, prudence, and wisdom above all others: and that after his baptism Christ came down upon him from the Supreme power in the shape of a dove, &c. This was Cerinthus' doctrine, as Irenæus<sup>c</sup> repeats it, who lived so nigh those times that he may well be thought to be born in the time of Cerinthus. And this is the same for substance with the latter of those two sorts of Socinianism that I mentioned; only it was by him blunderingly expressed: that which they style λόγος he calls Christ, and he does not allow him to be born of a virgin. They must be dexterous and happy men indeed that can reconcile St. John's Gospel to that very sense against which it was purposely written.

This Cerinthus and Ebion, both whose doctrine concerning our Lord was (as Irenæus in the next chapter<sup>d</sup> testifies) the same, were the first Socinians in the world, except those mentioned John vi. 42, who said, *Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?*

XV. 2. But besides: what hopes can we have of any firm union with these men, who at the same time that they desire to be re-

<sup>u</sup> Coloss. i. 16, 17.

<sup>x</sup> Rom. ix. 5.

<sup>y</sup> John xvii. 5.

<sup>z</sup> John xvi. 28.

<sup>a</sup> Lib. 3. c. 11.

<sup>b</sup> De Script. Eccl. v. Joannes. [or, de

Scriptoribus illustribus, (as this treatise is more frequently called,) cap. 9.—Op. tom. ii. p. 830, edit. Vallars.]

<sup>c</sup> Lib. i. c. 25.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. c. 26.

ceived into communion with the catholic church, do set forth the faith thereof in as ill colours as possibly they can; calling it ‘unintelligible mystery,’ and their own, ‘clear reason?’ That which we hold they describe as ‘seeming impossibilities, absurdities, and ‘contradictions:’ theirs is a ‘rational, obvious, and accountable ‘faith.’ And they express themselves as men that were coxsure, that if that act of parliament, which they call ‘a bill in name and ‘pretext against immorality and blasphemy, in truth and real design against the Unitarians<sup>e</sup>,’ were taken out of the way, we should all presently turn Socinians. (It is to be noted that this act<sup>f</sup> came out much about the same time that they were favoured with that unexpected light.)

They ought not to be so hasty: there is another book in the way, and that is the scriptures. If they were abolished, and other records of the church with them, we freely grant that we should not naturally have any notion of a Trinity, of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in one Godhead; nor should we ever have thought of being baptized in such a name, nor have known of the *Word which was God, being made flesh*. These mysteries, we grant, would have been unintelligible.

But then there would have been another inconveniency in that way of knowing God which they propose, viz. in entertaining only such notions of him as we can form by natural reason and *clear ideas*. For some few persons of more refined intellectuals would conceive him to be a spiritual Being far above the properties and passions of body and matter. Others, that could form no notion of a spirit, would say, This is unintelligible mystery: we must have a God that has a body, or else we shall think him to be nothing. These latter would be subdivided: for some would believe that he is made of a very fine, subtle, and ethereal matter, quite different from that which may be seen or has any limbs, &c. But others, and these the far greatest part of mankind, would contend that a God that is supposed to see, and hear, and judge, without any ears or eyes, is an absurdity, impossibility, contradiction, a thing of

<sup>e</sup> [Life of T. Firmin, p. 26.]

<sup>f</sup> The Act, 10th William III, cap. 35, [alias 32,] entitled, ‘An Act for the more effectual suppressing of Blasphemy and ‘Profaneness,’... enacts, that, ‘Whereas many persons have of late years ‘openly avowed and published many ‘blasphemous and impious opinions, contrary to the doctrines and principles of ‘the Christian religion, &c. . . . . Be it ‘enacted... that... if any person hav-

‘ing been educated in, or at any time ‘having made profession of, the Christian ‘religion . . . shall by writing, &c. . . . ‘deny any one of the persons in the holy ‘Trinity to be God... and shall be duly ‘convicted, &c. &c., he shall be disabled ‘from all places, civil, ecclesiastical, or ‘military; and for the second offence ‘shall be further disabled, and imprisoned,’ &c. &c.



which we can form no *clear idea*: so they would have a God with eyes and ears as good as any painter could make.

The experience of all ages of the world shews that what I say is no fancy, but matter of fact. This way therefore would not do, except they would join to it the policy of the papists, who do preserve the true notion of God, as he is set forth in scripture, for the use of the learned and such as they allow to read the scripture; but keep at the same time wooden gods for the use of the mob.

God Almighty give us all the modesty and humility to think that his way of existing may well be such as we cannot comprehend, any more than a worm can comprehend what reason or speech or a soul is: and quietly to acquiesce in that account which he has been pleased to give of his own nature, and of what we are to believe concerning him: and to take it according to the plain meaning of those whom he has inspired to write it: and to judge ourselves, as we are indeed, far incapable of explaining the manner of it; and much more incapable of any ability of trying and examining the truth of it by our natural ideas of the things themselves. This last is impudent in those who do own the divine inspiration of the writers.

XVI. The great progress which they boast they should make, has no example for their encouragement in former ages of the church. Cerinthus and Ebion had some followers; but that was before the canon of scripture, and particularly St. John's Gospel, was completed and divulged; and it was mostly in wild countries, as Arabia deserta<sup>s</sup>, &c. After the writings of the apostles were

80. divulged, several single persons, Artemon, Theodotus,  
(A. D. 180.)  
160. Paulus of Samosata, &c., attempted to set up such a sect,  
(A. D. 260.) but never proselyted any region or city: and Photinus,  
245. though a very eloquent man, and setting up in the Arian  
(A. D. 345.) times, was presently condemned by all parties: so that  
275.  
(A. D. 375.) Epiphanius, who wrote but thirty years after that he began to vent his heresy, and before Photinus himself was dead, as it seems, tells him, that 'his heresy of all others was the easiest to  
' be confuted, not only by skilful men, but by any that had any  
' tolerable understanding of the sense of scripture<sup>h</sup>.' And a little after: 'The heresy of this impostor is dwindled away, having lasted  
' but a very little while.' And Theodoret says, that 'in his time it  
' was quite forgot;' and so, he says, were 'all the other heresies  
' that had denied Christ's divinity, Cerinthians, Ebionites, Sabelli-  
' ans, &c., so that the very names of those sects were to many un-

<sup>s</sup> Epiphan. in Hær. Ebionitarum.

<sup>h</sup> Hær. 71.



‘known<sup>i</sup>.’ And whereas one Bonosus<sup>j</sup>, about, or a little after the time of Photinus, went about to vent the same doctrine in Dacia, he was so far from having any number of followers, that he himself or his name is hardly known in history ; and Theodoret seems never to have heard of him.

Mahomet the impostor, arising in the foresaid Arabia, (of which place Epiphanius says, ‘it was the chief nest of the Ebionites and ‘Nazarenes, as I have,’ says he, ‘often already observed<sup>k</sup>,’) was the only man that after these times ventured to broach the doctrine against Christ’s divinity : and he indeed with his successors have converted a great part of the world ‘with a sudden irresistible progress :’ but then they have accordingly laid aside the name of Christians, and disowned the scriptures, as being plainly against them in this matter, though they do believe Christ to have been a great Prophet.

Since that, in Poland, and such places bordering on the Mahometans, this opinion has been entertained by some few as a middle sort of religion between the Christian and Mahometan. And now of late it is come into Holland, and from thence into England, serving for the use of such as being staggered in their faith by the arguments of the deists, which are rife in those countries, yet will not go so far with them as to renounce Jesus Christ and the scriptures ; but take a middle way, holding with the catholics that he is a true prophet, and the Messiah promised, and that he died and rose again, and will be our Judge ; but with the deists denying his divinity, and holding that he had no being before he was born or conceived in human flesh. They with the catholics say that the scriptures are (originally and as they came out of the apostles’ hands) God’s word, and not feigned by men ; but with the deists, that what they say of Christ’s divinity has been interpolated, or must be explained so as to fit with our natural conceptions, which, they say, cannot admit the notion of a Son of God that is properly one in essence with the Father, nor of such a Son of God taking on him the human nature, when the Father does not. To believe such strange things on the credit of revelation, is, they say, to give great advantage to the deists who deny it all.

This opinion, I say, never had any considerable number of followers in the world. The Arian, I grant, had ; but that does not nigh so plainly contradict the scriptures.

XVII. Now to return to that which gave the occasion of this

<sup>i</sup> Hæret. Fab. lib. ii. cap. ult.

<sup>j</sup> Mercator, Dissert. contra Anathematismos Nestorii. 522.

<sup>k</sup> Hær. 40.

digression: The catholics, as we see here by Gregory Nazianzen, would not baptize or receive to their church an Arian, nor any one that did not profess belief in the holy Trinity and the divinity of Christ. The catholic church is of the same mind still. These men do make an overture, and a declaration of their purpose of joining themselves to the church, and they do many of them put it in practice. If they are truly reconciled to the catholic faith, nothing were more desirable: but for that there is need of a better test, and it is a question whether the church ought to receive them without better satisfaction than this scheme of agreement. They own the Apostles' Creed indeed, which our church makes use of in baptism: but by disowning the Nicene, they shew that they do not own the other in the same sense that the church does, but repeat the same words in a very equivocal meaning. When we say, 'I believe in 'Jesus Christ his only Son,' &c., we do by the phrase of believing *in* him, mean believing in him as in God properly so called: and so we understand likewise the form of baptism in his name, together with the Father and Holy Spirit. And so did the ancients: this Gregory, speaking of the Holy Spirit, and how we are baptized in his name, 'If he be a creature,' says he, 'how do we believe in him? 'For it is one thing to believe *in* any one, and another to believe 'something *concerning* him. For the one is peculiar to God: the 'other common to any thing<sup>1</sup>.' If these men mean quite another thing in both these, I cannot see how we and they have *one faith* or *one baptism*; nor indeed how we worship the same God: for the God whom we worship is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

A difference in understanding the meaning of some articles of lesser moment, viz. of Christ's descent into hell, is not of the same nature, nor does make an instance for this purpose. If any man differ in opinion from the received tenets of the church in smaller matters, and therefore cannot join in some particular collect, office, prayer, or clause of a prayer, wherein something relating to those tenets is expressed, we grant, what these men plead, that St. Paul's rule, *If in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless whereto we have attained, let us walk by the same rule*<sup>m</sup>, &c., teaches that such a man should continue in communion, and conform to all that he can, and omit the saying Amen to that which he judges a mistake. Bp. Stillingfleet<sup>n</sup> has fully proved this to be the meaning of that place against the dissenting ministers, who were not willing that the separation should sink so.

<sup>1</sup> Orat. de Spiritu Sancto.

<sup>m</sup> Phil. iii. 15, 16.

<sup>n</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, p. ii. § 19.

And we can well enough allow of Mr. le Clerc's explication of Rom. xiv. 1, 'Him that is weak in the faith, receive you without examining his doubtful opinions,' and that the church ought to receive such an one. But all this is in differences about such matters as St. Paul there instances, in meats, drinks, or other things not of the foundation. But the doctrine concerning the person of Jesus Christ, and the satisfaction for our sins by him made, is, if any thing be, of the foundation.

I think the church of England has at this time the worst luck in this respect that any church ever had. There are numerous bodies of her people who hold all the same faith with her, that do against her will make schisms from her communion on occasion of differences in opinion, which are no just ground for separation, which party soever be supposed to be in the right. These she calls and invites to communion in prayers and sacraments, in which they might join even on supposal that they could not part with their particular opinions: and they, either out of peevishness, or else being overpersuaded by their leaders, who find their account in continuing separate bodies whereof they may be heads, do refuse to join even in those things wherein they agree in opinion with us. On the other side, these men who give but a poor account of their agreement with us in fundamentals, declare of their own accord (whether it be to shelter themselves from penalties, or not, I know not) that they will however join with us.

The least that can be said is, that it behoves every curate, who has good ground to believe concerning any of those that resort to his communion, that they are enemies to the doctrine of the divinity of our Saviour (and there are up and down more of them than one would think), to take advice of the bishop how far such are to be admitted to communion.

XVIII. I mentioned the satisfaction of our Saviour for our sins. It is known how derogatory an explication the Socinians have given of that. They have sometimes so spoke, as if the main or only design of his death were to give us a good example of suffering patiently; fearing that if too much value were put on his blood as a sufficient ransom for the sins of the world, it must be yielded to be the blood of one that was God in a proper sense as well as man. But whereas the New Testament does almost in every chapter speak of the redemption, propitiation, sacrifice, price, ransom, purchase, paid or wrought by him, and does lay the stress of our salvation upon our *faith in his blood*<sup>o</sup> as well as in his doctrine: they do

<sup>o</sup> Rom. iii. 24, 25.



(after having explained away as much of this article as possibly they can) yield that he did satisfy for us a little, or redeem us a little. I have heard one of them in company, and in a braving way, explain it thus: ‘It is as if a man owed me a thousand pounds, and not being able to pay, a friend of his, who had some interest in me, should intercede with me to forgive him the debt; and to move me the more, should offer to pay twelvepence in the pound for him, and I in condescension to this friend should accept it for payment in full.’

This is to count *the blood of the covenant wherewith we are sanctified*<sup>v</sup> a much more mean and ordinary thing than the scripture does every where represent it. And that which brought this passage of a discourse in company to my memory, was the words which these men use<sup>q</sup> to shew the soundness of their faith in that matter; ‘We believe that the Lord Christ by what he did, and what he suffered, was,’ by the gracious acceptance of God, ‘a true and perfect propitiation for sinners that repent.’ This is what any catholic or any Socinian either, may say, and yet have a very different faith about this article.

The other errors with which they are charged, and do not by that agreement revoke, are great; but not to be named the same day with these.

XIX. As for the assemblies which they talk of holding ‘for divine worship distinct from the assemblies of any other denominations of Christians: but these to be not by the way of schism or separation from the church, but only as fraternities in the church, who should take a more special care of that article,’ [viz. of the unity of the Godhead,] there would be by God’s grace no need of them. The catholic church does, and ever did, and ever will hold and publish that doctrine in the first place and above all others. The Athanasian Creed, against which they make their chief exceptions, declares this in words as absolute as any they can desire to be devised; that though the Father be God, Lord, Almighty, &c., and the Son and Holy Spirit likewise; yet there are not three Gods, Lords, Almighties, &c., but one God, one Lord, one Almighty: and would by parity of reason have said; so the Father is Spirit, the Son Spirit, and the Holy Ghost Spirit: yet not three Spirits, but one Spirit.

XX. They confess themselves that all systems, catechisms, councils, have defined this. But they add, ‘especially since the Lateran council,’ &c., thereby leaving open a door for that slander of a

<sup>v</sup> Heb. x. 29.

<sup>q</sup> [Account of Firmin’s Religion, p. 19.]



friend<sup>r</sup> of theirs to take place, who goes about to make the world believe that anciently, in the times of the Nicene council, and for some time afterward, the Christians held the faith of the Trinity so as to make three Gods in it.

This slander of an outlandish author, our Socinians do greedily embrace and confidently aver: which has, as to most of the particulars by which they would prove it, been fully answered by bishop Stillingfleet<sup>s</sup>: and I have occasionally, in another placet said something to some of the rest on which they insist, and to that open affront given by the said slanderer to all the churches that use the Nicene Creed, which he says they must either expunge out of their confessions and liturgies, or else renounce the article of one God, pretending that the faith held forth in that creed is Tritheism. But it comes in my way there by the by only.

All that I mention it here for, is to shew what an antipathy this sort of men have to that creed, and how they accordingly endeavour to blacken it: which is, as I shew in another place<sup>u</sup>, the most ancient copy of a Christian creed that is now extant in the world, and the most universally subscribed to by all Christians, and has been now for so many ages accounted the only firm test and barrier of the catholic church against such as deny the divinity of our Lord Christ: being of opinion, that we can have no sound communion with those that renounce it: and that it is a vain and ill advised thing to hope in these late ages of the church to pitch or agree on any fitter symbol or test of a catholic Christian. It should be the more unexceptionable with them, because it has not the words, *Trinity, person, &c.*, against which their objections chiefly lie. And yet those of them among us that do put in practice the foresaid project of communicating with the church, do, as far as I understand, generally renounce it, and instead of it they give here a profession of their faith, in words subject to great ambiguity.

The great bishop Stillingfleet<sup>x</sup> having occasion to speak of that canon<sup>y</sup> of the first council of Arles, wherein they decree, That if any that come over from a sort of heresy there specified, did offer themselves to communicate with the catholics, ‘they should be examined by the priests, whether they had a right faith of the ‘Trinity,’ &c. And if so, they were to be admitted with imposition of hands. ‘But if being examined, they do not confess this

<sup>r</sup> Mr. Le Clerc, Supplement to Hammond; item Critical Epistles, &c.

<sup>s</sup> Vindication of the Trinity, ch. 6.

<sup>t</sup> Part ii. ch. 5. § 8.

<sup>u</sup> Part ii. ch. 9. § 9, 10, 11, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Vindication of the Trinity, ch. 9.

<sup>y</sup> Can. 8.

‘Trinity, then they must be baptized anew.’ He asks this question, ‘What Trinity do they mean? of mere names or cyphers, or of one God and two creatures joined in the same form of words, as our Unitarians understand it?’

And to the same purpose St. Cyprian, arguing that such as had received baptism from some heretics that had monstrous opinions about the Deity, ought not to be admitted to communion without a new baptism, says thus: ‘If by that baptism of theirs the man have obtained remission of sins, then is he sanctified and become a temple of God. Now I ask of what God? If they say of God the Creator, that could not be, since he did not believe in him. If of Christ; one that denies Christ to be God cannot be a temple of him. If of the Holy Spirit; whereas these three are one, how can the Holy Spirit be pleased with him who is against either the Father or the Son?’

We may by the by take notice, that it appears by this and by another plainer place of St. Cyprian<sup>a</sup>, that the text of St. John, *These three are one*<sup>b</sup>, either was read then (which was long before the time of Arius) with the same context that it is now, or at least was understood in the same sense.

If these ancient Christians would not admit such men, though recanting their opinions, without a new baptism; I mean, if they had been baptized into any other faith than the true faith of the Trinity; much less would they have entertained communion with them holding still their opinions.

It is St. Gregory’s mentioning in this oration of baptism a thing that is so applicable to the case of the church at present, that has drawn me so far from my subject.

## CHAP. XII.

### *Quotations out of St. Basil.*

§ I. ST. BASIL also has an oration or sermon to the catechumens, or new converted Christians, to persuade them to baptism without such delays as many used: but it has not any express mention of the case of infants as to baptism: yet it has some things that are cited *pro* and *contra* to that purpose. It may not be amiss to give a short abstract of it, reciting, as I did in the other, the original words of such places only as do by some consequence relate to this question.

<sup>z</sup> Epist. 73. ad Jubaianum.

<sup>a</sup> Lib. de Unitate Ecclesiæ.

<sup>b</sup> 1 John v. 7.

*Oratio Exhortatoria ad Baptismum.*<sup>c</sup> [§ 1.]

He begins with observing, that Solomon, mentioning a time for every thing, says, *There is a time to be born, and a time to die*, placing the birth first: but that he being to speak of the spiritual birth, must speak of our spiritual death first. Which having done, and shewn the lost condition we are in by nature, and that baptism is the recovery from it, he proceeds:

II. Καὶρὸς μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπιτήδειος· ἴδιος ὕπνου, καὶ ἴδιος ἐγρηγόρσεως· ἴδιος πολέμου, καὶ ἴδιος εἰρήνης. Καὶρὸς δὲ βαπτίσματος ἅπας ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος. ‘There is therefore a several season proper for several things; a time peculiar for sleep, and one peculiar for watching; a time for war, and a time for peace. But any time of one’s life is proper for baptism.’ And afterward, ‘Be it day or night, be it but an hour or a minute, yet the most proper time is Easter: for that is the solemnity of the resurrection; and baptism is to us a ground of our resurrection.’

III. Then having insisted on the advantage of Christ’s baptism above that of St. John’s, and how all are invited to it; he addresses thus to them: Ὁκνεῖς καὶ βουλευή καὶ διαμέλλεις; ἐκ νηπίου τὸν λόγον κατηχούμενος οὐπω συνέθου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ; πάντοτε μανθάνων, οὐδέπω ἤλθες πρὸς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν; πειραστὴς διὰ βίου, κατὰ σκοπος μέχρι γήρως; πότε γενήσῃ χριστιανός; πότε γνωρίσομέν σε ὥς ἡμέτερον; &c. ‘Do you demur and loiter, and put it off? When you have been from a child catechised in the word, are you not yet acquainted with the truth? Having been always learning it, are you not yet come to the knowledge of it? A seeker all your life long, a considerer till you are old, when will you be made a Christian? When shall we see you become one of us? Last year you were for staying till this year: and now you have a mind to stay till next. Take heed that by promising yourself a longer life, you do not quite miss of your hope. You do not know what change to-morrow may bring,’ &c.

IV. When I first copied out this passage to put it into this collection, I thought it to be the strongest evidence against the general practice of infant-baptism in those times of any that is to be found in all antiquity, (though it has not, I think, been taken notice of by any of the antipædobaptists,) for it plainly supposes that a considerable part of St. Basil’s auditory at this time were such as had been from their childhood instructed in the Christian religion (and consequently in all probability born of Christian parents), and yet not baptized.

But I have since, in searching after other passages, had occasion

<sup>c</sup> [Tom. ii. p. 113. edit. Benedictin. Paris, 1721.]



more than enough to observe, that there were in these times abundance of people that were well-willers to Christianity, half Christians, who yet put off their absolute owning of it, or being baptized into it, for a great many years. These men had, during that their unsettled mind, several children: and they could not with any face or conscience desire of the church baptism for these their infant-children, unless they would first find in their hearts to accept it for themselves. And so these children came to be taught the doctrine of Christianity, and yet not baptized into it; because their parents, though liking of that religion, yet were not at present fully resolved themselves. But this is no proof that any Christians, after they were once baptized themselves, did ever suffer their infant children to go without baptism.

This place itself is a plain proof that there were a great many such men as I have mentioned: for several of the men to whom St. Basil is here preaching, and whom he blames for putting off baptism so long, must be thought to have children; which children must be in the case that I speak of. So that this place affords an answer to the objection drawn from itself, or from any other that speaks of children instructed in religion and yet not baptized.

V. He goes on with his sermon, and shews the advantages of this profession to which he invites them, and the lightness of the yoke which he advises them to put on. And proceeds to speak of the necessity of baptism in these words: [§ 2.] ‘Ο Ἰουδαῖος τὴν περιτομὴν οὐκ ὑπερτίθεται διὰ τὴν ἀπειλὴν, ὅτι πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἣτις οὐ περιτμηθήσεται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς. σὺ δὲ τὴν ἀχειροποιήτον περιτομὴν ἀναβάλλῃ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τῆς σαρκὸς, ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τελειουμένην, αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀκούσας, Ἀμὴν, Ἀμὴν, &c. ‘A Jew does not delay circumcision because of the threatening that *every soul that is not circumcised the eighth day shall be cut off from his people*: and dost thou put off the circumcision made without hands in the putting off the flesh, which is performed in baptism, when thou hearest our Lord himself say, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except one be born of water and of the spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God?* If Israel had not passed through the sea, they had not got rid of Pharaoh: and unless thou pass through the water, thou wilt not be delivered from the cruel tyranny of the Devil,’ &c.

‘If your sins are many; be not frightened because of their number: where sin has abounded, there grace will much more abound, if you will receive it. If they are small and not very heinous, why are you afraid of the time to come, since you have ordered your past



‘ life well, even when you were not furnished with the Christian law?’ [§ 3.]

VI. ‘ Look upon your soul to be placed in a balance ; the angels draw you one way, the devils the other : to which will you incline ? Which shall overcome, carnal pleasure or holiness of life ?

‘ Do not you remember how in Egypt the destroyer passed over the houses that were marked, when in those that were not so he slew the firstborn ?

‘ If a physician could undertake by any art to make you young again when you are old, you would earnestly long for that day in which your florid youth should be restored : and yet now when it is told you that your soul, defiled with all manner of sin, may be renewed and born again by baptism, you slight so great a benefit.’ [§ 4.]

‘ Are you young ? guard your youth with the bridle of baptism. Is the flower of your age past ? do not endanger the loss of your viaticum ; do not miss of your preservative ; do not miss of your eleventh hour as if it were your first.

‘ I know your reason, though you think to conceal it. “ Stay a little longer,” say you, “ I will make use of the flower of my age in pleasure, &c., and then, when I have enough of that, I will give it over and be baptized.” Think you that God does not see your purpose, or that he will give his grace to so wicked a heart ?—— If you leave off your sins for old age, thanks to your inability. We regard those that are sober by choice, not by necessity.

‘ Who has given you a lease of your life ?’ &c. ‘ Do not you see children often snatched from the breast, and others die in the flower of their age ?’ &c.

‘ Do you stay for baptism till some fever force you to it, when you will neither be able to speak the holy words, nor perhaps to hear them, the disease being got into your head ?’ [§ 5.]

The Devil cries, *Give me to-day, and give the morrow to God.* But God says, *To-day if you will hear my voice.* ‘ The Devil gives us hope of to-morrow ; but when to-morrow is come, as a fraudulent divider, he again asks that day for himself, and yields the next to-morrow to God.’ [§ 6.]

‘ The sanctification of baptism you commend in words, but in your deeds you follow the things that yourself condemn. Take heed you do not repent of this purpose when it is too late, and will do you no good. Learn wisdom by the example of the foolish virgins,’ &c.

‘ Do not you, brother, in like manner put off from year to year, from month to month, from day to day, till a day seize you that

‘you are not aware of, and the opportunity of well-doing fail you together with your life,’ &c.

‘Then you will lament at your very soul, but nobody will pity you: you will utter dreadful moans, but they will be taken for a delirium. Who will give you baptism at such a time? &c. and perhaps it will be night, and nobody present to help you or baptize you.’

‘But you say, “God will then hear me.” Yes, because you hear him now. “He will grant me some longer time.” Good reason, because you make so good use of what he does grant you.’ [§ 7.]

‘Wretch, do not deceive yourself: let nobody seduce you with vain words, sudden destruction will come upon you, and ruin like a storm,’ &c. ‘The dreadful angel will fetch away your soul,’ &c.

‘What thoughts will you have then? “Fool that I was! Why did not I put off this heavy load of sin then when I might easily? that I did not wash off these foul stains? &c. Oh woful purpose of mine! for the short pleasure of sin to suffer eternal torments. I might now have been one of those that shine in glory. Oh just judgment of God! I was called and would not hear.”’ &c.

‘These and such like complaints you will make then, if you depart hence before you be baptized,’ &c. [§ 8.]

All the rest is such like pathetic exhortation to break off sin, and enter without delay into the Christian covenant: and were very proper to be used to those who nowadays put off repentance to a death-bed.

VII. St Basil has also two other<sup>d</sup> pieces about baptism, written at the desire of some that put questions to him, some concerning baptism, and some on other subjects (being probably persons that were preparing themselves to be baptized). But all the discourse is (as the occasion was) of what is proper for adult persons to know and consider, when they come to be baptized: and has nothing that peculiarly concerns infants.

He puts these persons in mind *ὅτι δεῖ πρῶτον μαθητευθῆναι τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τότε καταξιωθῆναι τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος*, ‘that they must be first instructed, and then admitted to baptism.’ [Lib. i. c. 2. § 1.] (These words taken by themselves, some cite as making against infant baptism) that they must resolve to forsake, not some sins, but all. He shews them the difference of three sorts of baptism, viz. that of Moses, that of John, and that of Christ. The baptism of Moses made a difference of sins; for all sins were not forgiven by it. It required sacrifices to be joined with it. It stood strictly on outward

<sup>d</sup> Lib. primus et secundus de baptismo. [Tom. ii. p. 624, &c.]

cleansing. It enjoined an unclean person to continue separate for some time; depended upon days and hours, &c. The baptism of John had none of these inconveniences: yet he shews how that also is far surpassed by that of Christ.

VIII. Coming to a more particular explication of our Saviour's words, John iii. 3, 5. of being *born again*, he says, 'I take that word [*ἀνωθεν*, again] to signify the rectifying of our former birth, which 'was in the filth of sin: as Job says; *no person is clean from sin, though his life be but of one day*; [so they read that text of Job<sup>e</sup>;] 'and as David laments and says, *I was conceived in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bring me forth.*' [I. c. 2. § 7.]

IX. There is a passage in a sermon of St. Basil's (that which he preached on a fast-day, that was kept for the great famine and drought) of which I have not skill enough to judge whether it be a proof of infants' baptism then used or not. The judgment of it depends on one's knowing particularly to what part of the public divine service and prayers people were wont to be admitted before they were baptized; and to what not; for St. Basil speaks here of little boys and young children joining in the prayers. I know that some have written accurately the history of the catechumens, and in what parts of the Liturgy they did partake. But the passage being short, I can sooner set it down at adventure (that so they that are skilled in that matter may judge whether it be to purpose or not) than I can at present have recourse to those writings.

It is this. He is telling them that their continuance in their sins hindered their prayers from being heard. But besides, says he, 'What sort of prayer is it that we make? The grown men, all but 'a few, follow their trades, &c. a very few are left to join with me in 'the prayers; and those lazy and yawning, and staring about,' &c. οἱ δὲ δὴ παῖδες οἱ μικρότατοι οὗτοι, οἱ τὰς δέλτους ἐν τοῖς διδασκαλείοις ἀποθέμενοι καὶ συμβοῶντες ἡμῖν, ὥς ἄνεσιν μᾶλλον καὶ τέρψιν τὸ πρᾶγμα μετέρχονται, &c. ἀναίσθητα δὲ καὶ ἄμεμπτα βρέφη πρὸς τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν ἐπείγεται καὶ ἀθροίζεται, οὔτε τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῶν λυπούντων, οὔτε τοῦ συν- ἡθως προσεύξασθαι γινώσιν ἢ δύναμιν ἔχοντα. σὺ μοὶ πάρελθε εἰς μέσον, &c. 'And these little boys that have left their books at school, and 'do make the responses together [or sing together] with us, do it 'as a piece of pleasure, and the work of a play-day,' &c. 'And the 'infants that have no sense, nor any guilt, they also are brought 'thick and in crowds to the public confession, who neither under- 'stand the occasion of the grief, nor are capable of praying accord- 'ingly. Come yourselves to the office, you that have the load of



‘sins upon you. It is you that ought to prostrate yourselves, to ‘mourn and weep,’ &c. *ἔδει δὲ παρῆναι κακείμεν, μετὰ σοῦ πάντως, οὐ μόνον.* ‘They [the infants] ought to be present indeed, but to come ‘along with you, and not alone by themselves<sup>f</sup>.’

If the catechumens did not use to be admitted before their baptism to those parts of the office, that consisted in psalmody and making the responses; then it is a sign that these little boys had been baptized. But if they did, it is only my labour lost in reciting it here. P. S. I am since certified by a very learned man, that these children must have been baptized.

X. But a more material evidence than any that can be found in St. Basil’s writings is taken from his practice: of which there is an  
 320.  
 (A.D. 420.) authentic record given by Theodoret and other historians that lived but a little after St. Basil, in reference to the baptizing of a child of Valens the emperor. This emperor, being an Arian, and having been prevailed on by the Arians to take an oath<sup>g</sup> that he would always maintain that faith, and persecute the contrary, viz. that of the catholics, did accordingly, and raised great persecution against all the catholic bishops in his dominion, and particularly against St. Basil, who was bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. But having great afflictions in his family at the same time, which looked like judgments; and among the rest, his only child sick and at the point of death; he was wrought on, partly by the guilt of his conscience, and partly by his wife’s entreaty, to abate of the rigour which he was then using against St. Basil, who was by all looked on as a pious and good man. And he also sent for him to come and pray for his child. And then (as Theodoret<sup>h</sup> proceeds to relate the matter), *ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος καταλαβὼν τὰ βασίλεια, καὶ τὸν τοῦ βασιλέως υἱὸν παρ’ αὐτὴν ὄντα τὴν τελευτὴν θεασάμενος, πρὸς τὴν ζωὴν τοῦτον ὑποστρέψειν ὑπέσχετο, εἰ τοῦ παναγίου βαπτίσματος διὰ τῶν εὐσεβούντων ἀξιωθείη. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐξελήλυθεν.* ‘Ο δὲ τῶν ὄρκων κατὰ τὸν ἀνόητον μεμνημένος Ἡρώδην, τοῖς συμπαραούσιν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς συμμορίας Ἀρείου βαπτίσει τὸ παιδίον προσέταξεν. ‘The great Basil coming ‘into the palace, and seeing the emperor’s son at the point of death, ‘undertook that he would recover if he had baptism given him by ‘the hands of the godly [meaning the catholics]; and having said ‘this he went away. But he [the emperor] remembering, like ‘foolish Herod, his oath, gave order to some that were present of the ‘faction of Arius, to baptize the child,’ &c.

<sup>f</sup> [Homil. dicta tempore famis et siccitatis; Op. tom. ii. p. 62, &c.—§ 3.]

<sup>g</sup> Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. c. 12.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. lib. iv. c. 19. [p. 174, edit. Valesii, 1673.]



The issue was, the child died, and Valens for the present repented both of his oath and cruelty, and went to St. Basil's church, and made his oblations: but afterward he revolted to his former temper.

All that is doubtful in this passage is, whether this child were so young as that his baptism deserves to be called infant-baptism; or whether he were of such age as to be capable to be baptized on his own profession. Theodoret, we see, calls him *παιδίον*, which properly signifies *a little child* or *infant*; and is the same word that is used Mark x. 13. *προσέφερον παιδία*, *They brought young children*, and Matt. ii. 11. *εὑρον τὸ παιδίον*, *They found the young child wrapped in swaddling clothes*. Gregory Nazianzen<sup>i</sup> says that he was there present with St. Basil at that time: and he compares the emperor's afflicting himself for his child to David's, for his in the like case, but mentions not the age. Socrates<sup>j</sup> calls him *νήπιον υἱὸν τοῦ Οὐάλεντος* 'the infant son of Valens.'

But there is among the works of Ephraem Syrus, published in Latin,<sup>k</sup> a sermon on St. Basil, in which he mentions this story; but speaks so of the child, as if he had some understanding of religion: for he makes Basil covenant with Valens; 'If you will so deliver him to me, that I may bring him to the true faith, and free him from the impiety of the Arian doctrine,' &c. And again, 'They [the Arians] baptized him with water, but not with the Spirit, for they taught him to reject the Son of God,' &c. But the works of this Father which we have are of such doubtful credit, (they must first have been translated out of Syriac; for he understood no other language, and they abound with very frivolous stories,) that a quotation out of them cannot come in competition with the received historians.

XI. Valesius<sup>l</sup> has gone about to find out by chronological characters the age of this child when he died; not in any inquiry about infant-baptism, but to set some passages right in chronology. He makes him to be six years old. The proofs of it are something forced, and are too nice and far from our purpose to be repeated here. He judges that it was he that was consul A. D. 369, with Victor, (though the name there be Valentinian, and the historians call this child's name Galates,) and that Socrates mistook Valentinian the younger for this child: and that it was on him that Themistius made that consular oration (for the flattery of that time was to make emperors' infant children consuls, and speak orations to them), where he says,

<sup>i</sup> Orat. in Basilium.

<sup>j</sup> Hist. lib. iv. c. 26.

<sup>k</sup> [Ephrem. Syr. Opera Latine, p. 725, Colon. 1616. Cf. ed. Græce et Syriace, t. ii.

p. 294. Romæ, 1732-46.]

<sup>l</sup> Annot. in Socrat. lib. iv. cap. 10. item 26.

‘ Even while you are carried in people’s arms, you make war together  
‘ with your father.’

But suppose it were so, he must yet be baptized with the form of infant-baptism; for a child of six years old is capable of no other. And if he were so old as six years, he must be born before his father was baptized into the Christian religion himself. For by this account this child was born to Valens before the victory over Procopius the usurper, and so Valesius owns. Now that victory was before the beginning of Valens’ war against the Goths: and it was in that war that he being minded to go to battle in person, ‘thought not fit to  
‘ go unprovided of the divine grace, but to guard himself with the  
‘ armour of baptism<sup>m</sup>.’ And if the child were born before his father was baptized, that might be the reason that he was not baptized quickly after his birth.

### CHAP. XIII.

#### *Quotations out of St. Ambrose.*

*Ambrosius, Comment. lib. i. in Sti. Lucæ cap. 1. [§ 37.]*

§ I. HE is there commenting on those words, Luke i. 17, where  
<sup>274.</sup> the angel prophesies of John the Baptist, *He shall go be-*  
(A.D. 374.) *fore him in the spirit and power of Elias.* And after having shewn in several particulars how John in his office did resemble Elias, and having mentioned that miracle of Elias of dividing the river Jordan, he adds these words:

‘ Sed fortasse hoc supra nos et supra apostolos videatur exemplum.  
‘ Nam et ille sub Elia diviso amne fluvialium recursus undarum in  
‘ originem fluminis (sicut dicit scriptura, Jordanes conversus est  
‘ retrorsum) significat salutaris lavacri futura mysteria; per quæ in  
‘ primordia naturæ suæ, qui baptizati fuerint parvuli a malitia re-  
‘ formantur.’

‘ But perhaps this may seem to be fulfilled<sup>n</sup> in our time and in  
‘ the apostles’ time. For that returning of the river waters back-  
‘ ward toward the spring head, which was caused by Elias when the  
‘ river was divided (as the scripture says, *Jordan was driven back*),  
‘ signified the sacrament of the laver of salvation, which was after-  
‘ ward to be instituted; by which those infants that are baptized

<sup>m</sup> Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. cap.  
11, 12.

<sup>n</sup> [The edition of Ambrosius which Dr.  
Wall made use of read *expletum* for *exem-*

*plum* in this passage: but the Benedic-  
tine editors have corrected the text, on  
the unanimous authority of their manu-  
scripts.]

‘are reformed back again from wickedness [or a wicked state] to the primitive state of their nature,’

He means, they are freed from the guilt of original sin, and in some sense reduced back to the primitive state, in which man was before that happened. He plainly speaks here of infants as baptized ‘in the apostles’ time,’ as well as in his own; and makes St. John (if his meaning be to speak of the persons baptized by him), in baptizing infants for the reformation of their nature back again to the primitive purity of it, to resemble Elias in turning back the waters to their spring head.

This passage of St. Ambrose is quoted by St. Austin, lib. i. contra Julian. c. 2.

I said in the former editions, that St. Ambrose does here say in effect, that John Baptist did baptize infants. My reason was, because he had before, in the parallel between John and Elias, observed, that as Elias was in the desert, so was John: as Elias was fed by ravens, so John lived upon coarse food: as Elias boldly rebuked Ahab, so John did Herod. And (among other comparisons), ‘Ille Jordanem divisit; hic ad lavacrum salutare convertit.’ ‘As Elias separated [or drove back] the waters of Jordan; so John brought persons to the baptism of salvation.’ Which, joined with what he says here, that the new formation of infants in baptism back to their primitive purity, was typified by Jordan turned back toward the spring head, does, I think, lead to such an interpretation of his words. But however (leaving that deduction of the chain of thought to the judgment of the reader) he does plainly speak of the baptism of infants used in the apostles’ time. Which is more to the purpose.

*Ambrosius* lib. ii. *de Abrahamo patriarcha*, lib. ii. c. 11. [§ 81, &c.]

II. He is here speaking of that part of the history of Abraham, where he is commanded to be circumcised, and to circumcise his infants; and of the severity of the penalty on an infant that is not circumcised: and has these words in relation to circumcision; ‘For a very good reason does the law command the males to be circumcised in the beginning of infancy, even the bondslave born in the house: because as circumcision is from infancy, so is the disease. No time ought to be void of the remedy, because none is void of guilt,’ &c. And a little after, ‘Neither a proselyte that is old, nor an infant born in the house, is excepted; because every age is obnoxious to sin, and therefore every age is proper for the sacrament.’ He also applies this to spiritual circumcision and baptism, and says, ‘The meaning of the mystery is plain. Those born in the house are the Jews, those bought with money are the Gentiles that



‘believed: for the church is bought with the price of Christ’s blood.  
 ‘Therefore both Jew and Gentile, and all that believe, must learn to  
 ‘circumcise themselves from sin, that they may be saved. Both the  
 ‘home-born and the foreigner, the just and the sinful, must be cir-  
 ‘cumcised by the forgiveness of sins, so as not to practise sin any  
 ‘more: for no person comes to the kingdom of heaven but by the  
 ‘sacrament of baptism:’ and at the end of that paragraph cites these  
 words of our Saviour, giving his note on them:

‘*Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest  
 ‘introyre in regnum Dei. Utique nullum excipit: non infantem, non  
 ‘aliqua præventum necessitate. Habeant tamen illam opertam pœ-  
 ‘narum immunitatem, nescio an habeant regni honorem.*’ [§ 84.]

‘For unless any person be born again of water and of the Holy Spirit,  
 ‘he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. You see he excepts no per-  
 ‘son, not an infant, not one that is hindered by any unavoidable  
 ‘accident.

‘But suppose that such have that freedom from punishment,  
 ‘which is not clear, yet I question whether they shall have the  
 ‘honour of the kingdom.’

This, as to the need of baptizing infants, is plain: but I know not  
 what to make of the word *opertam* in this sentence, unless it be to be  
 rendered as I have rendered it [‘which is not clear,’ or ‘of which we  
 ‘have no certain knowledge.’]

Many writers of the Greek church do speak of a certain middle  
 state in the life to come, in which infants that die unbaptized, and  
 also other persons that miss of baptism, not by their own fault, but  
 by some accidental hinderance, shall be placed; which place or state  
 shall not, as they think, partake, or not much partake, either of  
 happiness or torment. Gregory Nazianzen’s words to that purpose  
 are in the passages I cited of his<sup>o</sup> and I shall have occasion here-  
 after<sup>p</sup> to mention more. But this opinion of a middle state seems  
 not to have taken any footing in the Latin church at this time;  
 though it be since embraced by the papists, under the name of  
*limbus puerorum*.

St. Ambrose, who was conversant in the Greek writers, and, as St.  
 Hierome<sup>q</sup> observes, borrowed much out of their works, had met  
 with it there; and here mentions it, but calls it *opertam*, a thing not  
 certainly revealed or known, but hidden and uncertain. His meaning  
 is, that since our Saviour’s sentence of the necessity of baptism for  
 entering the kingdom of God is general, and does not except infants;

<sup>o</sup> Ch. 11. § 6.

<sup>p</sup> Part ii. ch. vi. § 4.

<sup>q</sup> Prefat. in lib. Didymi. [Op. tom. ii.  
 p. 106.]



it is very questionable, whether an infant unbaptized can have the said kingdom. And as for the middle state between heaven and hell, which some do suppose, it is to us a thing hidden or unknown whether there be any such state. One may observe in this passage, a thing which I have observed in many sayings of the ancients, that among the several names which they give to baptism, they often by this phrase [the forgiveness of sins] do mean the sacrament of baptism. The coherence of the sentence shews it here. ‘They must be ‘circumcised by the forgiveness of sins; for no person can come to ‘the kingdom of heaven but by the sacrament of baptism.’ And so it does in a passage of the epistle of Barnabas which I produce, part ii. ch. 9. § 6.

St. Austin, a little after these times, does earnestly labour to shew that there is no such state, though he had once so spoken as if he thought there might. I shall have occasion to produce his sayings onr one side and the others. He is the more earnest at this latter place against the middle state, because Pelagius had served himself of this notion to evade the argument which is taken from the need that infants have of baptism, to prove that they have original sin. For Pelagius said they have no sin: and if they die unbaptized, they will not be punished, but be in that middle state.

The quotations out of the book *de Vocatione Gentium*, and *Epist. ad Demetriadem*<sup>t</sup>, I have not, as many do, set down to St. Ambrose,

<sup>340.</sup> because they are not his, but Prosper’s or pope Leo’s:  
(A.D. 440.) who yet lived both of them but a little after our period.

<sup>344.</sup>  
(A.D. 444.) Every body has read how largely Prosper there disputes against those that would maintain that all the grace of God depends upon our use of free-will; shewing that they that use that method of explaining the events that happen, can never solve that difficulty, ‘how it comes to pass that so great a multitude of infants dying ‘unbaptized [or as he styles it, unregenerated] do perish.’ On which argument he has a whole chapter, pretending to shew that all must be attributed to God’s free giving or refusing his grace.

## CHAP. XIV.

### *Quotations out of St. John Chrysostom.*

§ I. ST. CHRYSOSTOM has had more of his works published  
<sup>280.</sup> than any of the foregoing, because every thing that he  
(A.D. 380.) preached or dictated was thought fit to be published; not

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xv. sect. 3. § 1, 2.

<sup>s</sup> Ch. xix. § 10.

<sup>t</sup> [See the preface of the Benedictine

editors, prefixed to the second volume of St. Ambrose’s works.]

that he had any greater skill in divinity than ordinary, but because of his golden tongue, from which he had this name, and which made the people that used to hear him say, ‘They had rather the sun should not shine, than that John should not preach.’ But of the multitude that were published a great many are lost; and, to make up the defect, a great many spurious ones have been set out under his name. The industry and skill of the latter ages, and particularly of sir Henry Savile<sup>u</sup>, has in a good degree fanned and distinguished the one from the other.

Therefore I shall omit the quotations about this subject that are found in those books that are either plainly spurious or suspected; though they are probably very ancient, and of men that lived at or about the same time. Of the first sort is the homily concerning Adam and Eve, in which is a passage mentioning infant-baptism; but it is plainly the work of some later author. Of the second is the homily on Psalm xiv, in which is a passage of the same subject, which is quoted in this controversy by many learned men, Cassander, &c., and even by bishop Stillingfleet<sup>x</sup>.

As for the passages in his genuine works, he has not many on this subject: for orators love only such subjects as may be adorned with flowers of rhetoric, of which so plain a thing as the baptizing of infants is not so capable; and for those which he has, I am not very confident that I have all that are in so many voluminous books: but those which I shall produce do plainly shew his sense, and the practice of the churches where he lived, which were Antioch and Constantinople.

*Hom. 40. in Genesin, Edit. Savil. tom. i. [Montf. tom. iv.]*

He had been speaking of circumcision, and observes how much more favourable and bountiful God is to the Christians in the baptism which he has appointed to them in lieu thereof; and says,

‘There was pain and trouble in practice of that, and no other advantage accruing from the circumcision, than this only; that by this sign they were known and distinguished from other nations.’

Ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα περιτομή, ἣ τοῦ βαπτίσματος λέγω χάρις, ἀνώδυνον ἔχει τὴν λατρείαν καὶ μυρίων ἀγαθῶν πρόξενος γίνεται ἡμῖν, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡμῶς ἐμπλήρησι χάριτος. Καὶ οὐδὲ ὠρισμένον ἔχει καιρὸν καθάπερ ἐκεῖ· ἀλλ’ ἔξεστι καὶ ἐν ἁλώρῳ ἡλικία, καὶ ἐν μέσῃ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ

<sup>u</sup> [Sir H. Savile published an edition of Chrysostom’s works, in the original Greek, in 8 volumes folio, at Eton, in 1612. Another, in Greek and Latin, was published at Paris, by Fronto Ducaeus, in 12 volumes folio, in 1633–1636. But

the most complete is that by the Benedictine father Montfaucon, in 13 volumes folio, published at Paris in 1718, &c.]

<sup>x</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, part iii. ch. 36.

γήρα γενόμενόν τινα ταύτην δέξασθαι τὴν ἀχειροποίητον περιτομήν· ἐν ᾗ οὐκ ἔστι πόνον ὑπομείναι, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτημάτων φορτία ἀποθέσθαι, καὶ τῶν ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ πλημμελημάτων τὴν συγχώρησιν εὐρέσθαι. 'But our 'circumcision, I mean the grace of baptism, gives cure without 'pain, and procures to us a thousand benefits, and fills us with the 'grace of the Spirit: and it has no determinate time, as that had; 'but one that is in the very beginning of his age, or one that is in 'the middle of it, or one that is in his old age, may receive this 'circumcision made without hands. In which there is no trouble 'to be undergone, but to throw off the load of sins, and receive 'pardon for all foregoing offences.' [§ 4.]

That ἄωρος ἡλικία signifies here, as I have rendered it, 'the beginning of age,' or infancy, appears both by the sense, and also by his use of the same word in the homily before, where giving the reasons why circumcision was appointed the eighth day, he makes this to be one:

1. Because the cutting of the flesh is more easily borne ἐν ἁώρῳ ἡλικία 'in the beginning of the age,' or infancy.

2. And his other reason is, 'that they might understand by the 'thing itself that it signified nothing to the soul, but was given for 'a mark of distinction;' and then he there again uses the same word, τὸ γὰρ ἄωρον παιδίον, τὸ μὴ γινώσκον τὰ γινόμενα, μηδὲ αἰσθησὶν τινα ἔχον, &c. 'For a *new-born* child, that knows not what is done 'to him, nor has any sense, what profit for his soul can he receive 'thereby?' &c. The word ἄωρος, which in some authors signifies *unseasonable*, or *out of time*, signifies with him *newly begun*, or *that has had no time pass over it*.

It is a very singular notion in divinity of this father, to say that circumcision had no spiritual import, but was only a badge of national distinction. The scripture, and the fathers too, generally speak of it as *the seal of the righteousness of the faith that Abraham had*<sup>z</sup>, and the covenant, or *seal of the covenant*<sup>a</sup> that God made with him and his seed. And that contains something more than that they should be known from other nations. It was, that *he would be their God, and they his people*<sup>b</sup>.

Also to argue, that circumcision could signify nothing to the soul, because it was given ἐν ἁώρῳ ἡλικία, in infancy, at the same place where one is to shew that baptism (which, as he himself grants, may also be given ἐν ἁώρῳ ἡλικία, *in infancy*) does convey so many

y Hom. xxxix. in Genesin, [§ 5.]

z Rom. iv. 11.

a Acts vii. 11.

b Gen. xvii. 7.



spiritual benefits, betrays some inadvertency or forgetfulness of what he had said before.

II. But it is more to our present purpose to observe the other difference that he makes: 'Circumcision was to be given on the eighth day: but baptism has no determinate time, but it is lawful that one in infancy, or one in middle age, or one in old age, do receive it.' Was it not the same in circumcision? If circumcision had been omitted in infancy, or if it were a heathen who came over to the Jewish religion in middle age, or old age, circumcision was given then, rather than not at all.

Or is his meaning this; that a Jew was obliged to circumcise his child in infancy, but a Christian parent may baptize his child in infancy, if he please; or he may, if he please, let it alone to be done at middle, or at old age? His words, as they stand here, might be capable of such a sense; but this is not reconcilable with what he says in other places of the necessity of baptism, and the danger in case a person die without it, which would often happen to children, if it were so deferred. He often speaks to this purpose, as Hom. i. *de pœnitentia*<sup>c</sup>: *Πρὸ δὲ βαπτίσματος οὐκ ἐστὶ πατρῶα λαβεῖν, οὐδὲ δέξασθαι κληρονομίαν.* And again, *Οὐδεὶς δὲ υἱὸς βαπτίσματος ἂν κληθεῖν χωρὶς.* 'There is no receiving or having the bequeathed inheritance before one is baptized;' and, 'none can be called a son till he is baptized.' And I have occasion to quote more of his to this purpose at another place<sup>d</sup>. St. Austin quotes a saying of his to this purpose in his disputes with Julian<sup>e</sup> (if he do not mistake an oration of St. Basil's for one of St. Chrysostom's; for the words are the same which I recited of St. Basil's). St. Austin is there proving that Chrysostom, as well as the other catholic doctors, owned original sin; which Julian denied, though he owned infant baptism.

'The same holy John, even he as well as the martyr Cyprian, teaches that the circumcision of the flesh was commanded in way of a type of baptism.' Then he recites these words, as from Chrysostom: 'A Jew does not delay circumcision because of the threatening,' &c. 'and dost thou delay the circumcision made without hands, &c.' as they stand recited above<sup>f</sup>. Then St. Austin adds, 'You see how this man established in the ecclesiastical doctrine compares circumcision to circumcision, and threat to threat: that which it is *not to be circumcised on the eighth day*; that it is *not to*

<sup>c</sup> [Sect. 4. Op. tom. ii. p. 285.]

<sup>d</sup> Part ii. ch. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. ii. contra Julianum, cap. ix.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. xii. § 5.



‘ be baptized in Christ: and what it is to be cut off from his people ;  
 ‘ that it is not to enter into the kingdom of heaven. And yet you  
 ‘ [Pelagians] say that in the baptism of infants there is no putting  
 ‘ off the flesh, i. e. no circumcision made without hands ; when you  
 ‘ affirm that they have nothing which needs to be put off: for you  
 ‘ do not confess them to be dead in the uncircumcision of the flesh,  
 ‘ by which is meant sin, especially that sin which is derived ori-  
 ‘ ginally: for by reason of this, our body is the *body of sin*<sup>h</sup>, which  
 ‘ the apostle says *is destroyed by the cross of Christ.*’

III. There is another passage in a homily of St. Chrysostom *ad Baptizatos*, which is not now extant in Greek, but is cited by Julian in Latin, and by St. Austin in Greek, which is full to this purpose of infant-baptism. The citations are in St. Austin’s lib. i. *contra Julianum*<sup>i</sup>; where Julian says thus:

‘ Holy John, bishop of Constantinople, denies that there is any  
 ‘ original sin in infants ; for in that homily which he preached con-  
 ‘ cerning baptized persons he says,

‘ “ Blessed be God, who only does wonders, who has created and  
 ‘ ordered all things: lo! they do enjoy the serenity of freedom, who  
 ‘ but even now were held in captivity: they are become citizens of  
 ‘ the church, who were in the vagabond state of aliens; and they  
 ‘ are entered into the lot of the righteous, who were under the con-  
 ‘ fusion of sin. For they are not only free, but saints; nor saints  
 ‘ only, but justified; and not only justified, but sons; and not only  
 ‘ sons, but heirs; not heirs only, but brothers of Christ; not only  
 ‘ his brethren, but coheirs; not coheirs only, but members of him;  
 ‘ not members only, but his temple; and not his temple only, but  
 ‘ organs of his Spirit. You see how many are the benefits of bap-  
 ‘ tism. And yet some think that the heavenly grace consists only  
 ‘ in forgiveness of sins: but I have reckoned up ten advantages of  
 ‘ it. For this cause we baptize infants also, though they are not  
 ‘ defiled with sin; that there may be superadded to them saintship,  
 ‘ righteousness, adoption, inheritance, a brotherhood with Christ,  
 ‘ and to be made members of him.” ’

IV. This sentence Julian brought to shew that Chrysostom’s sense was, that infants are baptized, not for forgiveness of sins, from which they are free, but only that they might have a right to Christ’s kingdom; which was exactly what Julian and his party, who denied original sin, would have.

<sup>g</sup> Col. ii. 13.

<sup>h</sup> Rom. vi. 6.

<sup>i</sup> [Cap. vi. § 21, apud Augustini Opera, tom. x p 509, edit. Benedictin.]

And indeed it was a shrewd place; and St. Austin has much ado to reconcile it to any good and catholic sense: he uses three ways to do it.

1. He shews how improbable it was that John, living in the catholic church, and being a renowned bishop in it, should really hold a doctrine so contrary to that which he had shewn by instances to be the general sense of all catholic doctors.

2. He produces other passages out of his writings, which do plainly own the orthodox doctrine of the guilt of original sin, however incongruously he may seem to speak in this place.

3. As to the place itself, he shews that Julian had not translated the words exactly true, but had given the expression a turn to his own advantage: for whereas the words are in the Greek, ‘though they have not any sins,’ Julian had made use of a faulty Latin translation, in which some copies read, ‘not defiled with sins,’ others, ‘with sin,’ in the singular number. Of which last copy St. Austin says, ‘I doubt some of your party have chosen to express it ‘in the singular number, that it might be taken for that *one sin*, ‘of which the apostle speaks; *judgment came by one [sin] to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification*.’ —You choose to word it, “not defiled with sin,” that that *one sin* of the first man might come into the reader’s mind.

‘But not to go by suspicions, and supposing this to be the mistake of the scribe, or the variety of the interpreter, I will set down the Greek words themselves which John spoke; *Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ παῖδια βαπτίζομεν, καίτοι ἁμαρτήματα οὐκ ἔχοντα*. Which is, “For this reason we baptize infants also, though they have not any sins.” You see, he did not say that infants are not defiled with sin, or sins; but, that they have not any sins. Understand it, *of their own*, and there is no dispute. But you will say, Why did he not say, *of their own*? Why do you think, but for this reason, because he, discoursing in the catholic church, supposed that he could be understood in no other sense; nobody was puzzled about that matter. You [Pelagians] not having then raised any controversy, he spoke with less caution.’ [§ 22.]

Perhaps there might have been added to St. Austin’s answer this; that the Greek writers, though they own this natural corruption, yet do not generally by the property of their language call it by the name of *sin*; but they express it by the name *natural defilement*, pollution, disease, and the like, that which the Latins call

*original sin.* The word ἁμαρτία, and especially ἁμαρτήμα, do properly with them signify an *actual* sin or transgression. So Theodoret, <sup>320.</sup> who lived a little after these times, and consequently (A.D. 420.) ought to speak with more caution, and was no favourer of Pelagianism, (for that was a time when Pelagius and his opinions having been lately condemned by canons and edicts in all parts of the world, it was no time for a bishop of the catholic church to own them,) yet speaks thus: ‘Baptism is not, (as the silly Messalians say,) a razor only to cut off sins that are past, which it does over and above. For if it had no other effect but that, what need we baptize infants, that have not tasted of sin? The sacrament promises not this only, but greater and higher things; for it is a pledge of future blessings, a type of the resurrection, a communion of Christ’s passion<sup>k</sup>,’ &c.

And this is made more plain by the phrase used by Isidorus Pelusiota (who as well as Theodoret was a disciple of St. Chrysostom, and both of them followers of his doctrine, and imitators, as far as they could, of his expression). For he, at the same place, speaks of infants as not having any sin, and yet being defiled with the corruption caused by Adam’s transgression. His words are,

‘Whereas your excellency wrote to me, desiring to know for what reason τὰ βρέφη ἀναμάρτητα ὄντα βαπτίζεται, infants that have no sin are baptized: I have thought it needful to give you my answer. Some, that speak below the dignity of the subject, say it is, that they may wash off that pollution, ρύπον, which is transmitted on human nature by the transgression of Adam. I also do believe that that is done; but not that only, (for that were not so great a matter,) but that a great many other graces far transcending our nature are thereby given<sup>l</sup>.’ And so he goes on to reckon up redemption, regeneration, adoption, &c., much to the same purpose as St. Chrysostom does.

This shews that in their way of speaking, infants, though acknowledged to have a pollution of nature from Adam which needed washing off, yet were said not to have ἁμαρτίας or ἁμαρτήματα, sins. And even those commendations of baptism, and the effects of it in infants, that it is redemption, regeneration, &c., do suppose an evil state from which they are redeemed, regenerated, &c., which state is the same that the Latins call *original sin*.

But be that how it will; St. Chrysostom speaks plainly of the practice of infant-baptism. And our present inquiry is to know the

<sup>k</sup> Hæret. Fab. lib. v. c. de Baptismo. [cap. 18. tom. iv. p. 292, edit. Paris. 1642.]

<sup>l</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. 195. ad Herminum Comitem. [p. 333, edit. Paris. 1638.]



practice of the churches, and not whether he had a right apprehension of all the grounds of it. If any in these times used it, and did not well apprehend the grounds of it, it is the greater sign that they were satisfied that it had ever been done.

*Chrysost. Hom. 23, in Acta Apost. [Tom. ix. ed. Montf.]*

V. He is there bemoaning that evil inclination, and that aversion to a godly life, that is universally found in men; which keeps from receiving of baptism those that are not yet baptized, and perverts from a godly course of life even those that have received it. And on that head says thus; Οἱ μὲν οὖν κατηχούμενοι τοῦτο σπουδάζοντες οὐδεμίαν ποιοῦνται ἐπιμέλειαν ὀρθοῦ βίου. Οἱ δὲ ἤδη φωτισθέντες, οἱ μὲν ἐπεὶ παῖδες ὄντες τοῦτο ἔλαβον, οἱ δὲ ἐν ἀρρωστίᾳ, καὶ ἀνευεγκόντες, ἐπειδὴ μὴ εἶχον προθυμίαν τινὰ ζῆσαι διὰ Θεόν, οὐδὲ οὗτοι σπουδὴν τίθενται. Οἱ δὲ ἐν ὑγιείᾳ λαβόντες, ὀλίγην ταύτην καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπιδείκνυνται, καὶ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν διατεθέντες θερμοὶ, μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ οὗτοι τὸ πῦρ ἔσβεσαν. ‘The catechumens being of this mind, [i. e. having this ‘aversion,] take no care of a godly life. And those that are baptized, some of them, forasmuch as they were children when they ‘received it, and some, for that they received it in a fit of sickness, ‘having put it off to that time, and having no mind to live godly, ‘shew no good inclination. And they that received it in their ‘health shew but very little: having been for the present zealously ‘affected, afterward even they let this fire of zeal go out.’ [§ 3. p. 189.]

Here it plainly appears, that part of the people he speaks to (viz. those that had been born of Christian baptized parents) had been baptized in infancy: and part of them (viz. those that had turned Christians in their adult age) had been baptized since: and some of the last sort were not yet baptized.

VI. Another passage of St. Chrysostom does not mention baptism by name; but yet it plainly refers to the custom of making on the infant’s forehead the sign of the cross at his baptism. It is this;

*Hom. 12, in 1 Epist. ad Corinthios<sup>m</sup>.*

He is there blaming the women for several superstitious and heathenish rites which they practised upon their new-born infants; one was, a custom that they had of rubbing the forehead of the child with a sort of dirt, prepared with some magical tricks, which was to preserve it from being bewitched. He tells them that such a practice, instead of guarding and purifying the infant, makes it abominable: the words are,

‘Ο βορβόρω χρίων πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ βδελυκτὸν ποιεῖ τὸ παιδίον; πῶς γὰρ



αὐτὸ προσάγει ταῖς χερσὶ τοῦ ἱερέως, εἰπέ μοι; πῶς ἀξιοῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου σφραγίδα ἐπιτεθῆναι παρὰ τῆς τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου χειρὸς, ἔνθα τὸν βόρβορον ἐπέχρισας;

‘He that anoints an infant so with that dirt, how can he think but that he makes it abominable? How can he bring it to the hands of the priest? Tell me, how can you think it fitting for the minister to make the sign on its forehead, where you have besmeared it with the dirt?’

## CHAP. XV.

*Quotations out of St. Hierome and St. Austin, before the Rise of the Pelagian controversy.*

278—310. (A. D. 378—410.)

Sect. 1. Out of St. Hierome's Letter to Leta.

THERE was never nigh so much occasion given to mention the <sup>278.</sup> baptism of infants in books and writings, before Pelagius (A. D. 378.) vented his heresy against the doctrine of original sin, as there was after that heresy was started: for as the disputes about that matter filled all the world, so the arguments which the catholics drew from the baptism of infants for original sin, and the Pelagians' answer to them, made a considerable part of those disputes.

These two fathers lived to see, and to bear a great part of the said disputes; but they had each of them written several books before that controversy began. The quotations out of their tracts against the Pelagians will be best understood if put in a chapter by themselves, together with some others out of Pelagius himself, and other managers of the same party, and ranked according to the order of time in which they were written; for they were mostly written by way of impleading and answering one another. I have therefore in this chapter selected some passages out of such writings of theirs as were before the said controversy, or did not at all relate to it: that the mixing of them may not disturb the order of the other.

*Hieronimus, Epist. ad Letam de Institutione filia; Epist. 7.*

[Epist. 107. Op. tom. i. p. 671. edit. Vallarsii.]

He is there admonishing that lady of the charge that lay on her conscience to take care of the education of her child, and that God does require of parents an account of the child's miscarriage, if it happen by their fault; and says,

‘Eli the priest brought on himself the anger of God for the faults of his children. He must not be a bishop that has children riot-

'ous or unruly. On the other side it is written of a woman, that *she shall be saved in [or by] the procreating of children, if they shall continue in faith, and charity, and holiness with modesty*<sup>n</sup>. If their adult age, when they are at their own dispose, be imputed to their parents; how much more the time of their infancy and tender years, which, as the scripture says, is not able to distinguish the right hand from the left, i. e. knows not the difference of good and evil?' Then follows this objection:

'Et quomodo, inquires, peccata patrum filiis non redduntur, nec filiorum parentibus, sed *anima quæ peccaverit, ipsa morietur*?

'Hoc de his dicitur qui possunt sapere, de quibus in Evangelio scriptum est; *Ætatem habet, loquatur pro se*. Qui autem parvulus est et sapit ut parvulus, donec ad annos sapientiæ veniat, et Pythagoræ litera (Y) eum perducatur ad bivium; tam bona ejus quam mala parentibus imputantur. Nisi forte æstimas Christianorum filios, si baptisma non acceperint, ipsos tantum reos esse peccati; et non etiam scelus referri ad eos qui dare noluerint: maxime eo tempore quo contradicere non poterant qui accepturi erant. Sicut e regione [alias, sic in regione vitæ<sup>o</sup>] salus infantium majorum *lucrum est.*' [§ 5.]

'And how then is it true, you will say, that the sins of the fathers are not imputed to the children, nor those of the children to the fathers, but the soul that sinneth, it shall die?'

'This is said of those that have understanding; of such as he was, of whom it is written in the Gospel, *He is of age, let him speak for himself*. But he that is a child, and thinks as a child, (till such time as he comes to years of discretion, and Pythagoras' letter (Y) do bring him to the place where the road parts into two,) his good deeds, as well as his evil deeds, are imputed to his parents. Unless you will think that the children of Christians are themselves only under the guilt of the sin, if they do not receive baptism: and that the wickedness is not imputed to those also who would not give it them; especially at that time when they that were to receive it could make no opposition against the receiving it. As also on the other side [or, as also in the kingdom of life] the salvation of infants is the advantage of their parents.'

Though St. Hierome calls himself an old man in one part of this epistle; yet it was written a great while (thirty years at least) before his death, and consequently twenty years before Pelagius vented

<sup>n</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 15.

<sup>o</sup> [Vallarsius' edition does not take notice of this various reading.]

his new opinion. For he speaks here of Eustochium, who was this lady's husband's sister, as a young girl; and yet his epistle to the said *Eustochium, de virginitate servanda*<sup>v</sup>, was written thirty years before his epistle to Demetrias on the same subject, as he himself observes in the latter.

His mentioning how great a sin it would be in Christian parents to neglect the baptizing of their infants, renders that improbable (which yet some learned men of late have supposed to be true) that his own parents (who, as it seems, were Christians) had neglected the baptizing him in infancy: and that he was not baptized till he came to Rome. Of which opinion, and the mistake on which it is grounded, I must say something, as also of some other such instances, in a chapter on that subject<sup>q</sup>.

Sect. 2. Out of St. Austin's book *De Sermone Domini in Monte*.

St. Austin was a man of note in the church, and continued writing<sup>288.</sup> of books for forty years and more. There never was any (A.D. 388.) one man whose pains were so successful in healing the wounds of the church, caused by schisms and heresies. His moderate and popular way of arguing had a great effect. Besides his writing against the Manichees, of whom he had been one, and some Arians that were then yet left; he had a main hand in reducing the Donatists, and confuting the Pelagians. These latter began but<sup>310.</sup> twenty years before he died, viz. anno Dom. 410. and he (A.D. 410.) had wrote several books before they appeared. The quotations that I shall produce at present are out of those former books. One is that which I briefly mentioned before<sup>r</sup>, viz. in his

Lib. i. *de Sermone Domini in Monte*, c. 27. [cap. xvi. § 45.  
tom. iii. p. 185. ed. Benedict.]

He being there to explain that part of our Saviour's sermon which forbids divorce, takes occasion to cite that advice of St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 12. that a Christian should not put away his wife, though she as yet continued in heathenism or unbelief: and repeats the words that follow in the text, and gives his paraphrase upon them thus:

'*Sanctificatus est enim, inquit, vir infidelis in uxore [fidei]; et sanctificata est mulier infidelis in fratre [fidei]*'<sup>s</sup>.

'Credo jam provenerat ut nonnullæ scēminæ per viros fideles, et viri per uxores fideles in fidem venirent: et quamvis non dicens nomina, exemplis tamen hortatus est ad confirmandum consilium suum. Deinde sequitur:

<sup>p</sup> [Epist. xxii. tom. i. p. 87.]

<sup>q</sup> Part ii. ch. 3. <sup>r</sup> Ch. 4. and 11.

<sup>s</sup> [The Benedictine editors omit the word

*fidei* in both cases, as being wanting in the manuscripts, and also forming no part of St. Paul's remark.]

*‘ Alioquin filii vestri immundi essent, nunc autem sancti sunt.*

*‘ Jam enim erant parvuli Christiani, qui sive authore uno ex parentibus, sive utroque consentiente sanctificati erant: quod non fieret si uno credente dissociaretur conjugium, et non toleraretur infidelitas conjugis usque ad opportunitatem credendi<sup>t</sup>.*

*‘ For, says he, an unbelieving husband has been sanctified by his believing wife, and an unbelieving wife by her believing husband.*

*‘ I suppose it had then happened that several wives had been brought to the faith by their believing husbands, and husbands by their believing wives. And though he does not mention their names, yet he makes use of their example to confirm his advice. Then it follows,*

*‘ Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.*

*‘ For there were then Christian infants that were sanctified [or made holy, i. e. that were baptized] some by the authority of one of their parents, some by the consent of both: which would not be, if as soon as one party believed, the marriage were dissolved, and the infidelity of the parties were not borne with till there were an opportunity of believing.’*

Here we see St. Austin’s sense of that expression of St. Paul, which has been of late the subject of so much debate. He judges St. Paul’s meaning to be this: it is advisable for a Christian husband, whose wife will not as yet own the faith of Christ, not to put her away; because it is probable that he may in time gain her to the true religion: such examples are by God’s grace very frequent. You commonly see the unbelieving party sanctified, or brought to faith and baptism, by the believing one. Were it not so, that the faith of the one did generally prevail against the infidelity of the other; the children of such would be generally left in their unclean state, and be brought up to heathenism: whereas we see now on the contrary, that those of you that live in a state of marriage with unbelievers, do generally so far prevail by God’s grace, that your children are made holy, or sanctified and dedicated to the true God by baptism.

If this explication do seem remote to us now; it is because we do not, so frequently as they did, use the word *sanctification* and *sanctified* for baptism and baptized. I believe it is not so little as a hundred times, that St. Austin for one, when he is to speak of infants or other persons baptized or to be baptized, expresses it *sanctified*, as we see he does here. If the reader pleases, he may turn back to ch. xi. § 9. where there is more said of that matter.

<sup>t</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 14.



And by what I shall produce hereafter<sup>u</sup>, it will appear that most of the ancients understood this text as St. Austin does.

Sect. 3. Out of St. Austin's books of Freewill.

*Augustinus de Libero Arbitrio*, lib. iii. cap. 23.

I. This treatise St. Austin wrote when he was a young man<sup>x</sup>, against the Manichees, who maintain, that as there is one eternal Principle or God that made the soul and all good things, so there is another that has created the body, and is the author of all wickedness, and other evils and calamities; and that one of these comes from a necessary principle as well as the other.

St. Austin shews that God created man with a freewill: and that all sin comes from the ill use of that freewill: and that all other evils are punishments for sin: and that every one shall be judged according as he has either used that freedom of will to good or abused it to evil: and then adds,

‘Some ignorant people make a slanderous objection against this doctrine, on account of infants dying, and of the bodily pains we often see them suffer: for they say, “To what purpose was such an one born, since he died before he merited any thing? Or what place shall he have in the future judgment, who cannot be among the righteous because he never did any good, nor among the wicked, since he never sinned?” To which we answer, That in the constitution of the universe, and the fit connexion of all the creation in its places and times, no human person can have been created without reason, where not so much as the leaf of a tree is superfluously made. But that is a superfluous question which they put of the merits of one that never merited any thing: for they need not fear that it should so happen, that there can be a life in a middle state between good and bad, and not a sentence of the judge in a middle way between reward and punishment.

‘Quo loco etiam illud perscrutari homines solent, sacramentum baptismi Christi quid parvulis prosit; cum eo accepto plerumque moriuntur priusquam ex eo quidquam cognoscere potuerint. Quia in re satis pie recteque creditur prodesse parvulo eorum fidem a quibus consecrandus offertur. Et hoc ecclesiæ commendat saluberrima auctoritas, ut ex eo quisque sentiat quid sibi prosit fides sua, quando in aliorum quoque beneficium, qui propriam nondum habent, potest aliena commodari. Quid enim filio viduæ profuit fides sua, quam utique mortuus non habebat? Cui tamen profuit matris, ut resurgeret.’ [§ 67. tom. i. p. 637.]

On which head men are wont to ask this question also: ‘What

<sup>u</sup> Chap. 19. § 19.

<sup>x</sup> Aug. *Retractat.* lib. i. cap. 9.

‘good the sacrament of Christ’s baptism does to infants? Whereas, after they have received it, they often die before they are able to understand any thing of it. As to which matter it is piously and truly believed, that the faith of those by whom the child is offered to be consecrated, profits the child. And this the most sound authority of the church does commend, that hence every one may judge how profitable his own faith will be to himself, when even another person’s faith is useful for the advantage of those that have as yet none of their own. For how could the widow’s son<sup>y</sup> be holpen by his own faith, whereof being dead he could have none? and yet his mother’s faith was useful for his being raised to life again.’

II. About forty years after the writing of this book (when Pelagianism had in the mean time arisen and sunk again),<sup>328.</sup> (A.D. 428.) some Semipelagians in France, who held still that opinion of Pelagius, that infants, dying unbaptized, shall, though they miss of the kingdom of heaven, yet live eternally without punishment, made use of these words of St. Austin to uphold their tenet; as if he had therein expressed himself in favour of the opinion of such a middle state.

Of this, and of other their objections, one Hilary gives him notice by letter. ‘They plead,’ says he, ‘that the case of infants is not to be made an example for that of grown persons. And even as to the case of infants; they say your holiness so spoke of it as if you would have it counted an uncertain thing whether there be any punishment for them; and the negative to be more probable. And you may remember that in your third book concerning freewill your words are such as might give them this occasion<sup>z</sup>.’

But St. Austin in answer<sup>a</sup> shews that they mistook what he spoke hypothetically, and *ad hominem* against the Manichees, for a positive speech. ‘Suppose,’ says he, ‘that at that time when I began my books of freewill, being then but a layman at Rome, or when I made an end of them, being then but a presbyter in Africa, I had been unresolved of that point, that infants not regenerated are under condemnation, and that those that are regenerated are thereby freed from it:—I hope there is no man so unjust or envious as to be against my learning better.

‘But whereas the truth is, that I ought not therefore to be thought to make any question of that matter, because I judged it fit to confute those against whom I disputed, in such a manner, that whether there be any punishment for original sin in infants, as the

<sup>y</sup> Luke vii. 12.

<sup>z</sup> Epistola libro de Prædestinatione Sanctorum præfixa, [Op. tom. x. p. 783.]

<sup>a</sup> Lib. de Dono Perseverantiæ; cap. 12. [§ 30. Op. tom. x. p. 836.]

‘ truth is; or there be not, as some mistaken people think: yet  
 ‘ still that mixture of the natures of good and evil, which the  
 ‘ Manichees fondly maintain, would have no reason to be believed.  
 ‘ God forbid that I should leave the matter of infants so, as to say it  
 ‘ is uncertain whether those that are regenerated in Christ, if they  
 ‘ die in infancy, do come to eternal salvation; and those who are not  
 ‘ regenerated do fall into the second death. Whereas that which is  
 ‘ written, *By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and*  
 ‘ *so it passed upon all mankind*<sup>b</sup>, can no otherwise be understood.’

This answer which he gives to the reflections which the Semipelagians made upon these his first writings may serve now for an answer to that which Grotius has reflected on them in like manner: he says, ‘ That St. Austin, before he was heated with the Pelagian disputes, never wrote any thing of the condemnation of unbaptized infants, not even to those lesser pains in the world to come<sup>c</sup>:’ intimating that he was not of that opinion before. But supposing that were true, that he did not in his former writings mention that matter; yet if we may believe him for his own sense, it was not but that he understood the thing to be so at the time of writing this book: but he had not the same occasion to speak of it that he had afterward.

This he more plainly expresses in a letter<sup>d</sup> to St. Hierome, written in the heat of the Pelagian controversy; where, having made mention of this book and this place, he says, ‘ for in that book I did make answer concerning the baptism of infants, *non sufficienter, sed quantum illi operi satis videbatur*; not handling it fully, but as far as was needful in that work; that it does profit even those that are not sensible of it, and have as yet no faith of their own. But I thought it not needful at that time to say any thing concerning the condemnation of those infants that depart this life without it: *Quia non quod nunc agitur agebatur*: ‘ Because there was none of that dispute raised then, which is now.’

But I shall by and by<sup>e</sup> have occasion to shew that in other pieces written before the Pelagian times, he speaks of their condemnation.

Sect. 4. Out of St. Austin’s books against the Donatists.

*Augustinus de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. iv. cap. 15.

I. St. Austin wrote this treatise and many others, against the  
<sup>300.</sup> Donatists; a party of Christians in Africa, who had made a  
 (A.D. 400.) schism from the church sometime before he was born, on the account of one Cæcilian a bishop; who, as they said, had in times of persecution, under the heathen emperors, denied his religion by

<sup>b</sup> Rom. v. 12.

<sup>c</sup> Annot. in Matth. xix. 14.

<sup>d</sup> Epist. 28, [166 in edit. Benedict. tom. ii. p. 583.]

<sup>e</sup> Sect. 5. § 6.



giving up the Bible to be burnt; and yet afterward was suffered to continue and do the office of a bishop in the church.

Cæcilian denied the matter of fact, and it could not be plainly proved: but these men were so peremptory and so fierce against him, as not only to renounce him, but also to renounce the communion of the church, which suffered him to continue among them in his office. And it came to such a height, that in St. Austin's time, their party, which was very numerous, did so abhor the settled church, that if any one who had been baptized in the church came over to them, they told him the baptism which he had received in so impure and defiled a church, and from the hands of such wicked men, was null and void; and so they baptized him anew. The church did not so with them; but if any that had been baptized by them came over to the church, he was received as one whose baptism was valid, though given by schismatics.

St. Austin manages thus: he shews the want of proof of the accusation, by producing the acts of court and records by which Cæcilian had been acquitted. But besides, shews that, suppose it were true, one is not to forsake a church because of one or more wicked men that are suffered in it. And particularly in this treatise sets forth the impiety of their practice in rebaptizing. He shews that baptism once given in the right form, viz. in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is valid; how heretical or impure soever the church be in which, or how wicked soever the man be from whose hands he receives it. [One may here note by the by, that this rule of St. Austin does, by the consent of most ancients, hold good, except in the case of the Paulianists, who seem to have kept the words of the form, (though St. Austin had been informed otherwise,) and yet their opinion concerning Christ was so abhorred by the Christians, that the council of Nice ordered them to be rebaptized, as I shall shew hereafter<sup>f</sup>.] He shews that the baptism is Christ's and not the minister's. And the validity thereof depends on God's authority, not on the goodness or sincerity of the person that officiates. And consequently that those who had been baptized by Cæcilian, or any other wicked bishop, were to be accounted to have their baptism valid: and the priests ordained by him were capable of giving baptism to others.

II. He goes on to shew by the example of Simon Magus, that baptism received with a wicked heart and purpose, (which is a worse circumstance,) is yet valid: and that such a man is to repent of his

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. ch. 5. § 7.



wickedness, but not to be baptized again. And if a man that is baptized in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have at that time some unsound opinion concerning the Trinity or any person thereof; he is to reform his opinion, but not to renew his baptism.

And he proves this by the example of those who are baptized young, when they have but an uncouth sense, or infants, when they have no sense at all, of the articles of faith, in these words:

‘Unde multi post baptismum proficientes, et maxime qui infantes, vel pueri baptizati sunt, quanto magis intellectus eorum serenatur et illuminatur, dum interior homo renovatur de die in diem, priores suas opiniones quas de Deo habebant, cum suis phantasmatis luddificarentur, irridentes et detestantes atque confitentes adjiciunt. Nec tamen ideo non accepisse baptismum existimantur, aut talem baptismum accepisse dicuntur, qualis fuit error ipsorum. Sed in eis et sacramenti integritas honoratur, et mentis vanitas emendatur.’ [§ 22.]

‘So that many persons increasing in knowledge after their baptism, and especially those who have been baptized either when they were infants, or when they were youths; as their understanding is cleared and enlightened, and their inward man renewed day by day, do themselves deride, and with abhorrence and confession renounce the former opinions which they had of God, when they were imposed on by their own imaginations. And yet they are not therefore accounted either not to have received baptism or to have received a baptism of that nature that their error was. But in their case both the validity of the sacrament is acknowledged, and the vanity of their understanding rectified.’

III. And a little after, ch. 23, he having had occasion to speak of the penitent thief, who obtained salvation without baptism, shews that that is no more an argument against the necessity of baptism, where it may be had, than the example of baptized infants obtaining salvation without faith is an argument against the necessity of faith, where the subject is capable of it. But that it is an argument that one of these may be without the other; and so that heretics, who neither have nor do teach the right faith, yet may give true baptism, (if they give it in the right form,) which ought not to be reiterated when the party comes to the true faith.

For that was one thing with which the Donatists upbraided the catholics, that they received heretics that came over to them, without giving them a new baptism.

He concludes this fourth book with these words:

‘Sicut autem in latrone, quia per necessitatem corporaliter defuit

‘ [baptismus], perfecta salus est; quia per pietatem spiritualiter ad-  
 ‘ fuit: sic et cum ipsa præsto est, si per necessitatem desit quod  
 ‘ latroni adfuit, perficitur salus. Quod traditum tenet universitas  
 ‘ ecclesiæ, cum parvuli infantes baptizantur; qui certe nondum pos-  
 ‘ sunt corde credere ad justitiam, et ore confiteri ad salutem, quod  
 ‘ latro potuit: quin etiam flendo et vagiendo cum in eis mysterium  
 ‘ celebratur, ipsis mysticis vocibus obstrepunt. Et tamen nullus  
 ‘ Christianorum dixerit eos inaniter baptizari. [cap. xxiii. § 30.]

‘ Et si quisquam in hac re auctoritatem divinam quærat: quan-  
 ‘ quam quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed  
 ‘ semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum rectis-  
 ‘ sime creditur: tamen veraciter conjicere possumus, quid valeat in  
 ‘ parvulis baptismi sacramentum, ex circumcisione carnis, quam prior  
 ‘ populus accepit. Quam priusquam acciperet, justificatus est Abra-  
 ‘ ham. Sicut Cornelius etiam dono Spiritus Sancti, priusquam  
 ‘ baptizaretur, ditatus est: dicit tamen apostolus de ipso Abraham;  
 ‘ *signum accepit circumcisionis, signaculum fidei justitiæ*, qui jam corde  
 ‘ crediderat, *et deputatum illi erat ad justitiam*. Cur ergo ei præceptum  
 ‘ est, ut omnem deinceps infantem masculum octavo die circumcideret,  
 ‘ qui nondum poterat corde credere, ut ei deputaretur ad justitiam;  
 ‘ nisi quia et ipsum per seipsum sacramentum multum valebat?—  
 ‘ Sicut ergo in Abraham præcessit fidei justitia, et accessit circum-  
 ‘ cisio signaculum justitiæ fidei: ita in Cornelio præcessit sanctificatio  
 ‘ spiritalis in dono Spiritus Sancti, et accessit sacramentum regene-  
 ‘ rationis in lavacro baptismi. Et sicut in Isaac, qui octavo suæ  
 ‘ nativitatis die circumciseus est, præcessit signaculum justitiæ fidei;  
 ‘ et quoniam patris fidem imitatus est, secuta est in crescente ipsa  
 ‘ justitia cujus signaculum in infante præcesserat: ita et in baptizatis  
 ‘ infantibus præcedit regenerationis sacramentum, et si Christianam  
 ‘ tenuerint pietatem sequetur etiam in corde conversio, cujus myste-  
 ‘ rium præcessit in corpore. Et sicut in illo latrone, quod ex bap-  
 ‘ tismi sacramento defuerat, complevit Omnipotentis benignitas, quia  
 ‘ non superbia vel contemptu, sed necessitate defuerat: sic in infan-  
 ‘ tibus, qui baptizati moriuntur, eadem gratia Omnipotentis implere  
 ‘ credenda est, quod non ex impia voluntate, sed ex ætatis indigentia  
 ‘ nec corde credere ad justitiam possunt, nec ore confiteri ad salutem.  
 ‘ Ideo cum alii pro eis respondent, ut impleatur erga eos celebratio  
 ‘ sacramenti; valet utique ad eorum consecrationem; quia ipsi re-  
 ‘ spondere non possunt. At si pro eo, qui respondere potest, alius  
 ‘ respondeat, non itidem valet. [cap. xxiv. § 30.]

‘ Quibus rebus omnibus ostenditur aliud esse sacramentum bap-  
 ‘ tismi, aliud conversionem cordis; sed salutem hominis ex utroque

‘compleri : nec si unum horum defuerit, ideo putare debemus consequens esse ut et alterum desit ; quia et illud sine isto potest esse in infante, et hoc sine illo potuit esse in latrone : complente Deo, sive ni illo, sive in isto, quod non ex voluntate defuisset : cum vero ex voluntate alterum horum defuerit, reatu hominem involvi.

‘Et baptismus quidem potest inesse, ubi conversio cordis defuerit : conversio autem cordis potest quidem inesse non percepto baptismo ; sed contempto non potest : neque enim ullo modo dicenda est conversio cordis ad Deum, cum Dei sacramentum contemnitur.

‘Juste igitur reprehendimus, anathemamus, detestamur, abominamur perversitatem cordis hæreticorum : sacramentum tamen evangelicum non ideo non habent, quia per quod utile est non habent. Quapropter cum ad fidem et veritatem veniunt, et agentes poenitentiam remitti sibi peccata deprecantur ; non eos decipimus, neque fallimus, cum correctos a nobis ac reformatos in eo quod depravati atque perversi sunt, ad regnum cælorum sic disciplinis cælestibus erudimus, ut quod in eis integrum est nullo modo violemus : nec propter hominis vitium, si quid in homine Dei est, vel nullum vel vitiosum esse dicamus.’ [cap. xxiv. § 32.]

‘And as the thief, who by necessity went without baptism, was saved ; because by his piety he had it spiritually : so where baptism is had, though the party by necessity go without that [faith] which the thief had, yet he is saved.

‘Which the whole body of the church holds, as delivered to them, in the case of little infants baptized : who certainly cannot yet believe with the heart to righteousness, or confess with the mouth to salvation, as the thief could ; nay, by their crying and noise while the sacrament is administering, they disturb the holy mysteries : and yet no Christian man will say they are baptized to no purpose.

‘And if any one do ask for divine authority in this matter : though that which the whole church practises, and which has not been instituted by councils, but was ever in use, is very reasonably believed to be no other than a thing delivered [or ordered] by authority of the apostles : yet we may besides take a true estimate, how much the sacrament of baptism does avail infants, by the circumcision which God’s former people received.

‘For Abraham was justified before he received that ; as Cornelius was indued with the Holy Spirit before he was baptized : and yet the apostle says of Abraham, *that he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith*, by which he had in heart believed, and it had been counted to him for righteousness. Why then was he commanded thenceforward to circumcise all his male infants



‘ on the eighth day, when they could not yet believe with the heart,  
 ‘ that it might be counted to them for righteousness; but for this  
 ‘ reason, because the sacrament itself is of itself of great import?—  
 ‘ Therefore as in Abraham the righteousness of faith went before,  
 ‘ and circumcision the seal of the righteousness of faith came after;  
 ‘ so in Cornelius the spiritual sanctification by the gift of the Holy  
 ‘ Spirit went before, and the sacrament of regeneration by the laver  
 ‘ of baptism came after. And as in Isaac, who was circumcised the  
 ‘ eighth day, the seal of the righteousness of faith went before, and  
 ‘ (as he was a follower of his father’s faith) the righteousness itself,  
 ‘ the seal whereof had gone before in his infancy, came after: so in  
 ‘ infants baptized the sacrament of regeneration goes before, and  
 ‘ (if they put in practice the Christian religion) conversion of the  
 ‘ heart, the mystery whereof went before in their body, comes  
 ‘ after.

‘ And as in that thief’s case, what was wanting of the sacrament  
 ‘ of baptism the mercy of the Almighty made up; because it was  
 ‘ not out of pride or contempt but of necessity that it was wanting:  
 ‘ so in infants that die after they are baptized, it is to be believed  
 ‘ that the same grace of the Almighty does make up that defect,  
 ‘ that by reason, not of a wicked will, but of want of age, they can  
 ‘ neither believe with the heart to righteousness, nor confess with  
 ‘ the mouth unto salvation. So that when others answer for them,  
 ‘ that they may have this sacrament given them; it is valid for their  
 ‘ consecration, because they cannot answer for themselves: but if for  
 ‘ one that is able to answer himself another should answer, it would  
 ‘ not be valid.—By all which it appears, that the sacrament of bap-  
 ‘ tism is one thing, and conversion of the heart another: but that  
 ‘ the salvation of a person is completed by both of them. And if  
 ‘ one of these be wanting, we are not to think that it follows, that  
 ‘ the other is wanting; since one may be without the other in  
 ‘ an infant, and the other was without that in the thief: God Al-  
 ‘ mighty making up, both in one and the other case, that which was  
 ‘ not wilfully wanting.

‘ But when either of these is wilfully wanting, it involves the per-  
 ‘ son in guilt. And baptism indeed may be had where conversion  
 ‘ of the heart is wanting; but conversion of the heart, though it may  
 ‘ be where baptism is not had, cannot be where it is contemned: for  
 ‘ that is by no means to be called conversion of the heart to God,  
 ‘ where the sacrament of God is contemned.

‘ Well may we therefore reprehend, anathematize, detest and abhor,  
 ‘ the perversion of heart that is in heretics: but yet we must not say



‘that they therefore have not the Gospel sacrament, because they have not that which should make it useful to them.

‘Therefore when they come to the true faith, and being penitent do desire that their faults may be pardoned; we do not deceive or cheat them, when correcting and reforming in them that wherein they were depraved and perverted, we do instruct them with holy discipline for the kingdom of heaven in such a manner, as that we do by no means violate that in them which is valid: nor for the fault of the man say that that which is of God in the man is either null or faulty.’

IV. I have transcribed this passage the larger, because Mr. Danvers, who had set up a pretence that the Donatists found fault with the catholics for baptizing infants, would prove it from this place. He had said ‘that Austin’s third and fourth books against the Donatists do demonstrate that they denied infants baptism: wherein he manageth the argument for infants’ baptism against them with great zeal, enforcing it by several arguments, but especially from apostolical tradition; and cursing with great bitterness they that should not embrace its.’ And when his answerers jogged him, and told him, that in the third book there was never a word about it; he said, the fourth book did however shew it. And yet in the fourth book there is nothing but what I here produce. And any one that can give any tolerable guess at the sense of what he reads, sees by this and the rest of the book, that St. Austin does not here argue against the Donatists, as if they denied infant baptism: but proves that baptism received from the hands of heretical or depraved priests is valid, though they give the baptized person a wrong account of the faith; by this reason, that infants’ baptism is valid, though they have as yet no account of the faith at all. And I have already shewn from Optatus<sup>b</sup>, that the catholics and Donatists had no difference about the nature of baptism, or way of administering it; but only about the purity or orthodoxy of the persons that gave it: and shall by and by have occasion to shew particularly that they baptized infants as well as the catholics<sup>i</sup>.

But what does he mean by saying that St. Austin cursed, &c.?

The Donatists reproached the catholics for receiving to their communion such as had been baptized among heretics, as Arians, Apollinarists, &c., without giving them, upon their coming to the communion of the church, a new baptism: as if they thereby owned communion with such heretics, or approved their doctrine. St. Austin

<sup>a</sup> Treatise of Baptism, Part ii. ch. vii. p.

223, edit. 1674.

<sup>b</sup> Ch. 9. § 1.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. 16. § 1, 2.

answers as we see, ‘We do [as well as you] reprehend, anathematize, &c., the perversion of heart, [or false doctrine] of the heretics: but we must not therefore say, that they have not the sacrament,’ &c. This is what this man, who could find antipædobaptism in every Latin book that he looked into, calls ‘cursing them that would not embrace infant baptism.’

Mr. Baxter says on this occasion, ‘Either this man had seen and read these books of Augustine mentioned by him, or he had not. If not, doth he use God’s church, and the souls of poor ignorant people with any tenderness? &c. If he understand not Latin, how unfit is he to give us the history of these antiquities! &c. But if he have read them, then I can scarce match him again, among all the falsifiers that I know in the world. I dare not be so uncharitable to him, as to think that ever he read them<sup>k</sup>.’ But to leave him, and go on:

Though St. Austin speak of infant baptism in this place but by the by, his words are, we see, a full evidence that it was then universally practised, and had been so beyond the memory of any man or of any record: that they took it to be a thing that had not been ‘enacted by any council,’ but had ‘ever been in use’ from the beginning of Christianity. And they had then but 300 years to look back to the times of the apostles, whereas we now have 1600. And the writings and records which are now lost, were then extant, and easily known.

Moreover, for the sorts or sects of Christians that were then; he says that *nullus Christianorum* ‘none of all the Christians’ (and then certainly not the Donatists with whom he was talking) had any other opinion than that it was useful or necessary.

This is to be understood with a limitation, which I shall shew<sup>l</sup> that he expresses elsewhere, provided they were such as made use of any baptism at all: for there were some sects that called themselves Christians, (but they were hardly allowed that name by any others,) who utterly refused the use of any baptism at all. Of whom I shall give some account at a place<sup>m</sup> convenient.

#### Sect. 5. Out of St. Austin’s Letter to Boniface.

*Augustini Epistola ad Bonifacium Episcopum;*

Epist. 23. [98 in edit. Benedict.]

I. Boniface, a bishop of St. Austin’s acquaintance, had wrote to him to desire his explication of two matters that appeared  
308. (A. D. 408. to him difficult to resolve. They do both relate to infants’ baptism.

<sup>k</sup> Confutation of the Strange Forgeries of Mr. Henry Danvers, sect. 2. ch. iv. § 7.  
[In his ‘More Proofs of Infants’ Church

‘Membership,’ &c. 8vo. 1675. p. 241.]

<sup>l</sup> Part ii. ch. 5. § 1.

<sup>m</sup> Part ii. ch. 6. § 1.

One was, ‘Whether such parents do their infants that are baptized any hurt, who carry them to the heathen temples and sacrifices to be cured by those impious rites of some infirmity they have. And if they thereby do them no hurt, then how it comes to pass, that the faith of the parents stands them in stead when they are baptized, and yet the apostasy of their parents does them no hurt.’

The other was, how that can be reconciled to truth, which the god-father answers in the child’s name at baptism, viz. that ‘he does believe; does renounce; will obey,’ &c., when he at present has no sense at all, and what he will have hereafter nobody knows.

A part of what St. Austin answers to the first of these, I have already recited in the chapter of St. Cyprian’s sayings<sup>a</sup>: because he does in this answer cite and explain one of the passages of Cyprian, which I had there cited. And another part of it in ch. iii. § 4; because it gives a full proof that the ancients took the word regeneration for baptism exclusively of all other senses.

The substance of the answer is, that original sin is at first derived from the parents to the child, because the child is at first a part of the parents: that after he is become a separate living person, the faith of the parents, or others that bring him to baptism, is available to him, because ‘the regenerating Spirit is one in the grown persons that bring the child, and in the child that is brought: but when the same grown persons commit that wickedness on the child, offering him, and endeavouring to engage him in the sacrilegious bonds of devils; there is not then one soul in both of them, that the crime should be communicated. For sin is not so communicated by the will of another which is distinct, as grace is communicated by the Holy Spirit which is one and the same. For the same Holy Spirit may be in this and in that person; although they mutually know it not one of another, and so the grace may be common: but the spirit of a human person cannot be in this and in that person; so that one sinning and the other not sinning, the guilt should be common.’

Some remaining parts of the answer relating to some particular things that Boniface had said, do here follow. [§ 5. tom. ii. p. 265.]

‘Nec illud te moveat, quod quidam non ea fide ad baptismum percipiendum parvulos ferunt, ut gratia spiritali ad vitam regenerentur æternam, sed quod eos putant hoc remedio temporalem retinere vel recipere sanitatem. Non enim propterea illi non regenerantur, quia non ab istis hac intentione offeruntur. Celebrantur enim per eos necessaria ministeria, &c.—Spiritus autem ille sanctus qui habitat

<sup>a</sup> Ch. 6. § 12.



‘ in sanctis, ex quibus una illa columba deargentata charitatis igne  
 ‘ conflatur, agit quod agit etiam per servitutem, aliquando non solum  
 ‘ simpliciter ignorantium, verum etiam damnabiliter indignorum.  
 ‘ Offeruntur quippe parvuli ad percipiendam spiritalem gratiam non  
 ‘ tam ab eis quorum gestantur manibus, (quamvis et ab ipsis si et  
 ‘ ipsi boni fideles sunt,) quam ab universa societate sanctorum atque  
 ‘ fidelium. Ab omnibus namque offerri recte intelliguntur quibus  
 ‘ placet quod offeruntur, et quorum sancta atque individua charitate  
 ‘ ad communicationem Sancti Spiritus adjuvantur. Tota hoc ergo  
 ‘ mater ecclesia, quæ in sanctis est, facit; quia tota omnes, tota  
 ‘ singulos parit. Nam si Christiani baptismi sacramentum, quando  
 ‘ unum atque idipsum est, etiam apud hæreticos valet et sufficit ad  
 ‘ consecrationem, quamvis ad vitæ æternæ participationem non suffi-  
 ‘ ciat: quæ consecratio reum quidem facit hæreticum extra Domini  
 ‘ gregem habentem Dominicum characterem; corrigendum tamen  
 ‘ admonet sana doctrina, non iterum similiter consecrandum: quanto  
 ‘ potius in catholica ecclesia etiam per stipulæ ministerium frumenta  
 ‘ purganda portantur, ut ad massæ societatem mediante area per-  
 ‘ ducantur?

‘ Illud autem nolo te fallat, ut existimes reatus vinculum ex Adam  
 ‘ tractum, aliter non posse dirumpi, nisi parvuli ad percipiendam  
 ‘ Christi gratiam a parentibus offerantur. Sic enim scribens dicis;  
 ‘ ut sicut parentes fuerunt auctores ad eorum pœnam, per fidem  
 ‘ parentum identidem justificentur: cum videas multos non offerri a  
 ‘ parentibus, sed etiam a quibuslibet extraneis; sicut a dominis ser-  
 ‘ vuli aliquando offeruntur. Et nonnunquam, mortuis parentibus suis,  
 ‘ parvuli baptizantur, ab eis oblatis, qui illis hujusmodi misericordiam  
 ‘ præbere potuerunt. Aliquando etiam, quos crudeliter parentes  
 ‘ exposuerunt nutriendos a quibuslibet, nonnunquam a sacris virgi-  
 ‘ nibus colliguntur, et ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum, quæ certe  
 ‘ proprios filios nec habuerunt ullos, nec habere disponunt.’ [§ 6.]

II. ‘ Let not that disturb you, that some people do not bring their  
 ‘ infants to baptism with that faith [or purpose] that they may by  
 ‘ spiritual grace be regenerated to eternal life, but because they think  
 ‘ they do procure or preserve their bodily health by this remedy.  
 ‘ For the children do not therefore fail of being regenerated, because  
 ‘ they are not brought by the others with this intention. For the  
 ‘ necessary offices are performed by them, &c.—And the Holy  
 ‘ Spirit that dwells in the saints, out of whom that silver dove that  
 ‘ is but one is by the fire of charity compacted, does what he does  
 ‘ sometimes by the means of men not only simply ignorant, but also  
 ‘ damnably unworthy. For infants are offered for the receiving of



‘ the spiritual grace, not so much by those in whose hands they are brought, (though by those too if they be good faithful Christians,) as by the whole congregation of saints, and faithful men. For they are rightly said to be offered by all those whose desire it is that they should be offered, and by whose holy and united charity they are assisted towards the communication of the Holy Spirit.

‘ So that the whole church of the saints does this office as a mother. For the whole church brings forth all her children, and the whole brings forth each particular.

‘ For if the sacrament of Christian baptism, which is one and the same, be available even among heretics for the consecration of a person, though it be not sufficient for his obtaining of eternal life (which consecration involves the heretic in the guilt of sin for using the Lord’s mark without the compass of the Lord’s flock : and yet the orthodox doctrine teaches that such a person is to be reformed, but not to be consecrated anew) :—how much more in the catholic church may the corn that is to be cleaned be brought in by the means of the straw, that by the help of the floor it may be gathered to the rest of the heap ?

III. ‘ But I would not have you mistake so as to think that the bond of guilt derived from Adam cannot be broken, unless the children be offered for receiving the grace of Christ by their own parents. For so you speak in your letter, “That as the parents were authors of their punishment, so they may also by the faith of their parents be justified ;” whereas you see that a great many are offered, not by their parents, but by any other persons ; as the infant slaves are sometimes offered by their masters. And sometimes when the parents are dead, the infants are baptized, being offered by any that can afford to shew this compassion on them. And sometimes infants whom their parents have cruelly exposed, to be brought up by those that light on them, are now and then taken up by the holy virgins, and offered to baptism by them who have no children of their own, nor design to have any. And in all this there is nothing else done than what is written in the Gospel, when our Lord asked who was neighbour to him that was wounded by thieves, and left half dead in the road ? and it was answered, *He that shewed mercy on him.*’

Here we see (beside the resolution of the main question, both Boniface and St. Austin taking it for granted that infants are to be baptized) that the ordinary use then was for the parents to answer for their children : but yet that this was not counted so necessary as that a child could not be baptized without that circumstance. Any

one that was on any equitable account owner of the child might bring it to baptism.

Neither did the baptism depend on the holiness, or right faith, or intention of those that brought the child. It was supposed to be done by the order and at the desire of the church, and particularly of those that assisted with their prayers at the office.

IV. He next proceeds to speak of the other question put by Boniface :

‘ Difficillimam sane quæstionem tibi proposuisse visus es in extremo inquisitionis tuæ : ea videlicet intentione qua soles vehementer cavere mendacium. Si constituam, inquis, ante te parvulum, et interrogem utrum cum creverit, futurus sit castus, vel fur non sit futurus : sine dubio respondebis ; Nescio. Et utrum in eadem parvula ætate constitutus cogitet aliquid boni vel mali ; dices, Nescio. Si itaque de moribus ejus futuris nihil audes certi promittere, et de præsentis ejus cogitatione : Quid est illud quod quando ad baptismum offeruntur, pro eis parentes tanquam fidedictores respondent, et dicunt illos facere quod illa ætas cogitare non potest, aut si potest, occultum est ? interrogamus enim eos, a quibus offeruntur, et dicimus ; Credit in Deum ? de illa ætate quæ, utrum sit Deus, ignorat : respondent, Credit : et ad cætera sic respondetur singula quæ quærentur. Unde miror parentes in istis rebus tam fidenter pro parvulo respondere, ut dicant eum tanta bona facere, quæ ad horam qua baptizatur, baptizator interrogat : tamen eadem hora si subijciam ; Erit castus qui baptizatur ? Aut, Non erit fur ? Nescio utrum audet dicere aliquis, Aliquid horum erit, aut, non erit ; sicut mihi sine dubitatione respondet, quod credat in Deum, et quod se convertat ad Deum.

‘ Deinde scripta tua concludens adjungis et dicis ; Ad istas ergo quæstiones peto breviter respondere digneris, ita ut non mihi de consuetudine præscribas, sed rationem reddas. [§ 7.]

‘ His literis tuis lectis et relectis, et quantum temporis angustia sinebant consideratis, recordatus sum Nebridium amicum meum ; qui cum esset rerum obscurarum, ad doctrinam pietatis maxime pertinentium, diligentissimus et acerrimus inquisitor, valde oderat de quæstione magna responsionem brevem : et quisquis hoc poposcisset, ægerrime ferebat ; eumque, si ejus persona pateretur, vultu indignabundus et voce cohibebat ; indignum deputans qui talia quæreret, cum de re tanta, quam multa dici possent deberentque, nesciret. Sed ego tibi non similiter, ut solebat ille, succenseo. Es enim episcopus multis curis occupatus, ut ego : unde nec tibi facile vacat prolixum aliquid legere, nec mihi scribere. Nam ille tunc

‘adolescens, qui talia breviter nolebat audire, et de multis in nostra  
‘sermocinatione querebat, ab otioso querebat otiosus. Tu vero  
‘cogitans nunc quis et a quo ista flagites, breviter de re tanta re-  
‘spondere me jubes. Ecce facio quantum possum : Dominus adjuvet,  
‘ut quod postulas possim. [§ 8.]

‘Nempe sæpe ita loquimur, ut pascha propinquant dicamus,  
‘crastinam vel perendinam Domini passionem ; cum ille ante tam  
‘multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit.  
‘Nempe ipso die Dominico dicimus ; Hodie Dominus resurrexit : cum  
‘ex quo resurrexit tot anni transierint. Cur nemo tam ineptus est,  
‘ut nos ita loquentes arguat esse mentitos, nisi quia istos dies secun-  
‘dum illorum, quibus hæc gesta sunt, similitudinem nuncupamus ?  
‘Ut dicatur ipse dies, qui non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis  
‘similis ejus : et dicatur illo die fieri propter sacramenti celebrationem,  
‘quod non illo die, sed jam olim factum est. Nonne semel immo-  
‘latus est Christus in seipso ? et tamen in sacramento, non solum  
‘per omnes paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur ;  
‘nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari.  
‘Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum  
‘sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent.  
‘Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina  
‘accipiunt.

‘Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis  
‘Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis  
‘Christi est ; ita sacramentum fidei fides est. Nihil est autem aliud  
‘credere, quam fidem habere. Ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulus  
‘credere, qui fidei nondum habet affectum ; respondetur fidem habere  
‘propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter con-  
‘versionis sacramentum ; quia et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem  
‘pertinet sacramenti. Sicut de ipso baptismo apostolus ; *Consepulti*,  
‘inquit, *sumus Christo per baptismum in mortem*. Non ait, Sepulturam  
‘significavimus : sed prorsus ait : *Consepulti sumus*. Sacramentum  
‘ergo tantæ rei non nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit. [§ 9.]

‘Itaque parvulum, et si nondum fides illa, quæ in credentium  
‘voluntate consistit, jam tamen ipsius fidei sacramentum fidelem  
‘facit. Nam sicut credere respondetur, ita etiam fidelis vocatur, non  
‘rem ipsam mente annuendo, sed ipsius rei sacramentum percipiendo.  
‘Cum autem homo sapere cœperit, non illud sacramentum repetet,  
‘sed intelliget : ejusque veritati consona etiam voluntate coaptabitur.  
‘Hoc quamdiu non potest, valebit sacramentum ad ejus tutelam  
‘adversus contrarias potestates : et tantum valebit, ut si ante rationis  
‘usum ex hac vita emigraverit, per ipsum sacramentum, commen-



‘ dante ecclesiæ charitate, ab illa *condemnatione, quæ per unum hominem intravit in mundum*, Christiano adjutorio liberetur. Hoc qui non credit, et fieri non posse arbitratur, profecto infidelis est, etsi habeat fidei sacramentum : longèque melior est ille parvulus, qui etiãsi fidem nondum habeat in cogitatione, non ei tamen obicem contrariæ cogitationis opponit ; unde sacramentum ejus salubriter percipit.

‘ Respondi, sicut existimo, quæstionibus tuis, quantum attinet ad minus capaces et contentiosos non satis, quantum autem ad pacatos et intelligentes plus forte quam sat est. Nec tibi ad excusationem meam objeci firmissimam consuetudinem, sed saluberrimæ consuetudinis reddidi quam potui rationem. [§ 10.]

‘ You reckon you have proposed a very hard question in the latter part of your letter, according to that temper of yours by which you are wont to be exceeding cautious of any thing that looks like a lie. You say thus :

‘ Suppose I set before you an infant, and ask you whether, when he grows up, he will be a chaste man, or, whether he will be no thief? your answer doubtless will be, I cannot tell. And, whether he in that infant age have any good or evil thought : you will say, I know not. Since therefore you dare not say any thing either concerning his future behaviour or his present thoughts ; what is the meaning that when they are brought to baptism, their parents, as sponsors for them, make answer and say, that they do that which that age can have no thoughts of ; or if they have, nobody knows what they are ? For we ask those by whom they are brought, and say, Does he believe in God ? concerning that age which has no knowledge whether there be a God or not : they answer, He does believe. And so in like manner answer is made to all the rest. So that I wonder how the parents do in those matters answer so confidently for the child that he does this or that good thing, which the baptizer demands at the time of his baptism : and yet, if at the same time I ask, Will this baptized person prove chaste, or, not prove a thief ? I question whether any one dare so answer, he will, or will not, be such or such a one ; as they answer without any hesitation that he does believe in God : he does turn to God.

‘ And then you conclude your letter with these words :

‘ “ I entreat you to give me a short answer to these questions, in such a manner as that you do not urge to me the prescription of the customariness of the thing, but give me the reason of it.”

‘ When I had read your letter over and over, and had considered it as far as my short time would allow ; it made me call to mind



‘ my friend Nebridius, who being a very diligent and sagacious  
‘ inquirer into matters that were obscure, especially such as concern  
‘ religion, could not endure a short answer to a weighty question,  
‘ and took it very ill if any one desired such a thing ; and would with  
‘ an angry voice and look reprimand him, if he were a person that  
‘ might be so used, as counting him unfit to ask such questions ;  
‘ who did not consider how much might and ought to be said on so  
‘ great a matter.

‘ But, I do not pretend to be angry with you in such manner as  
‘ he was wont to be ; for you are a bishop that have a great many  
‘ cares upon you, as well as I : so that neither have you the leisure  
‘ to read a long discourse, nor I to write one. For he being then a  
‘ young man that would not be answered in brief to such things, but  
‘ spent a great deal of talk with me, inquired as one at leisure from  
‘ one that was so too. But you, considering now your own circum-  
‘ stances that ask, and mine that am asked, bid me answer briefly  
‘ about so great a matter. And that I here do as well as I can : I  
‘ pray God to assist me, that I may be able to satisfy your demand.

‘ You know we often express ourselves so, as that when Good  
‘ Friday is nigh, we say, To-morrow or next day is our Lord’s pas-  
‘ sion : though it be a great many years ago that he suffered, and  
‘ his passion was never performed but once. So on the Lord’s day  
‘ we say, This day our Lord arose, though since he arose it be so  
‘ many years. Why is there nobody so silly as to say we lie when  
‘ we speak so, but for this reason, because we give names to those  
‘ days, from the representation they make us of those on which the  
‘ things were indeed done : so as that is called the very day, which  
‘ is not the very day, but answers to it in the revolution of time :  
‘ and that which is not done on that day, but was done a long time  
‘ ago, is spoken of as done on that day, because the sacrament of it  
‘ is then celebrated. Was not Christ in his own person offered up  
‘ (or sacrificed) once for all ? And yet in the sacrament he is offered  
‘ in the church (or in, or to, or among the people) not only every  
‘ Easter, but every day ; nor does he lie, who being asked, says, he  
‘ is offered. For sacraments would not be sacraments, if they had  
‘ not a resemblance of those things whereof they are the sacraments :  
‘ and from this resemblance they commonly have the names of the  
‘ things themselves.

‘ As therefore the sacrament of Christ’s body is after a certain  
‘ fashion Christ’s body :—and the sacrament of Christ’s blood  
‘ is Christ’s blood :—so the sacrament of faith is faith, and to  
‘ believe is nothing else but to have faith. And so, when an infant

‘ that has not yet the faculty of faith is said to believe ; he is said to  
 ‘ have faith, because of the sacrament of faith ; and to turn to God,  
 ‘ because of the sacrament of conversion : because that answer belongs  
 ‘ to the celebration of the sacrament. So the apostle on this same  
 ‘ subject of baptism says, *We are buried together with Christ by baptism*  
 ‘ *unto death*<sup>o</sup> : he does not say, We signify a burial, but he uses the  
 ‘ word itself, *We are buried*. So that he calls the sacrament of so  
 ‘ great a thing by the name of the thing itself.

‘ And so an infant, though he be not yet constituted a *fidel* (a  
 ‘ faithful Christian) by that faith which consists in the will of  
 ‘ believers ; yet he is by the sacrament of that faith : for as he is  
 ‘ said to believe, so he is called a *fidel*, not from his having the  
 ‘ thing itself in his mind, but from his receiving the sacrament  
 ‘ of it.

‘ And when a person begins to have a sense of things, he does not  
 ‘ repeat that sacrament, but understands the force of it, and by con-  
 ‘ sent of will squares himself to the true meaning of it. And till he  
 ‘ can do this, the sacrament will avail to his preservation against all  
 ‘ contrary powers : and so far it will avail, that if he depart this life  
 ‘ before the use of reason, he will by this Christian remedy of the  
 ‘ sacrament itself (the charity of the church recommending him) be  
 ‘ made free from that *condemnation, which by one man entered into the*  
 ‘ *world*.

‘ He that does not believe this, and thinks it cannot be done, is  
 ‘ indeed an infidel, though he have the sacrament of faith. And that  
 ‘ infant is much better, who though he have not faith in his mind,  
 ‘ yet puts no bar of a contrary mind against it, and so receives the  
 ‘ sacrament to his soul’s health.

‘ I have given such an answer to your questions as I suppose is, to  
 ‘ ignorant or contentious people not enough, and to understanding  
 ‘ and quiet people perhaps more than enough. Neither have I, to  
 ‘ spare my pains, urged to you the custom’s being so firmly grounded :  
 ‘ but I have, as well as I could, explained to you the reason of that  
 ‘ wholesome custom.’

How skilful or judicious the reader will judge this explication of  
 the reason of the custom to be, I know not. Nor is it much material :  
 since we are not now inquiring how acute St. Austin was, but what  
 it was that he and the rest knew to be true in point of fact. And  
 hereby we perceive plainly these matters following :

V. 1. That that was the practice for the godfathers (who were, as  
 I said, usually the parents) to make these answers in the child’s name.

The use of godfathers appeared before<sup>q</sup> from the words of Tertullian; but here it is set forth more particularly: and St. Austin says that these answers do belong to [or are a necessary appertenance of] the sacrament: and he had said in the former part of the letter, (which I omitted because of the length,) that they are *verba sacramentorum, sine quibus parvulus consecrari non potest*; ‘words of the sacrament, ‘without which an infant cannot be baptized.’ Whether he would not have excepted the case of necessity in danger of sudden death (as the church of England does) if there had been occasion of speaking of that, I know not: but it is plain he would have been against those that either decry this practice, or count it a thing of no moment. The church of Christ has always taken care that the blessings of God promised in this sacrament may be understood as conveyed conditionally or by way of covenant; which these questions and answers do most lively express.

VI. 2. We see that they then held as certain, ‘that children which ‘are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly ‘saved:’ for St. Austin here says in these last words that ‘he that ‘does not believe this is an infidel:’ which he would not say, if it had been counted at all doubtful. The same thing might have been observed from what he says above, sect. 3. § 2. ‘God forbid that I ‘should make any question whether infants regenerated and dying ‘in infancy do come to eternal salvation.’

3. If those learned Benedictines, who have managed the last edition of this father’s works<sup>r</sup> to set his books and epistles in their chronological order, have placed this epistle right; then we see here another proof of the mistake of Grotius<sup>s</sup>, who maintains, as I said<sup>t</sup>, that St. Austin, before he was heated with the Pelagian controversy, did never assert the condemnation of infants dying unbaptized, no not to those lesser or milder sufferings in the world to come. For they place this epistle (which is in their edition the ninety-eighth) anno. Dom. 408; which was before Pelagius vented his heresy: and yet here St. Austin, in saying, ‘They will, if they die before the use ‘of reason, be freed by this Christian remedy of the sacrament from ‘that condemnation which by one man entered into the world,’ plainly supposes that they would otherwise have been liable to it.

VII. 4. There are two other things observable from his words here, which are well worth the noting, though they do not relate to our subject. One is, that he speaks so as that we may be sure he had

<sup>q</sup> Chap. 4. § 9.

<sup>r</sup> [In eleven volumes folio, published at Paris, 1679-1700, and reprinted at Ant-

werp, with an appendix, in 1700-1703.]

<sup>s</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

<sup>t</sup> Sect. 3. § 2.



no notion of transubstantiation. For to say, that ‘sacraments have ‘a likeness [or resemblance] of those things whereof they are the ‘sacraments; and from this resemblance they commonly have the ‘names of the things themselves;’ and to exemplify this by saying, ‘The sacrament of Christ’s body is Christ’s body, and the sacrament ‘of his blood is his blood after a certain manner’ [or fashion]; and to speak of this as a thing so understood by all, is proof enough that he neither believed, nor had conceived or heard of any such doctrine as makes the body and blood of Christ to be there in a proper sense.

VIII. 5. Another is, that it was then the common custom for Christians in some churches, and probably in that where he lived, to receive the communion of Christ’s body every day. For so he says, ‘Christ in himself [or in his own person] was offered [or sacrificed] ‘but once: but yet in the sacrament [or in a sacramental way] he ‘is offered up every day.’ It is certain this was the custom then of the Christians at Rome: and that in many of the eastern churches, and some of the western, the custom was not to receive so often. For St. Hierome and St. Austin have each of them written letters on this subject in answer to some that had desired their opinion in relation to this difference; as Aug. Epist. 118. [ed. Benedict. 54.] *ad Januarium*: Hieronym. Epist. 28, [edit. Benedict. 52. Vallars. 71.] *ad Lucinum Batium*: See also Aug. *de Sermone Domini in Monte*, lib. ii. cap. 7. § 26, 27. and Gennad. *de Eccl. Dogm.* cap. 63<sup>u</sup>. Their opinion is, that in that and all such like ‘matters that are not determined by ‘scripture, nor by the authority of the universal church, one should ‘follow the usage of that church in which one lives.’ And St. Austin there says, that he had by long experience found this rule (which had been given him by St. Ambrose) to be of unspeakable use for the quieting men’s minds, and for the peace of the church.

This they say of receiving every day: but no person then would have spoken with such indifferency of the custom of any people (if there had then been any such) that used to receive so seldom as many among the protestants nowadays do. For Gennadius, *loc. citat.*, says, ‘Those that communicate every day I do neither commend nor blame: ‘but I would advise and persuade people to communicate every Lord’s ‘day; provided they have a purpose of forsaking sin.—But this I ‘speak of those who have not any capital or mortal crimes lying on ‘their consciences,’ &c. Those he advises to do penance first.

IX. 6. He does both in this letter, and also in the passage last before rehearsed, and in many other places, so speak as plainly to shew that he did not think nor pretend that infants that are baptized

<sup>u</sup> [Gennadius Massiliensis: Liber de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, 4<sup>o</sup>. Hamburgi, 1614.]



have in any proper sense faith or repentance, or conversion of the heart, &c. How much soever he is here pressed with the difficulty of explaining the reason why the godfather answers in the child's name, 'he does believe:' he does not for all that fly to the justifying of so great a paradox, as to say that the child does indeed in a proper sense understand, believe, or disbelieve any thing. He shews the words are true in a sacramental sense, but does not maintain they are so in a proper one. Nay, he plainly yields they are not: he grants that infants 'cannot as yet either believe with the heart, or 'confess with the mouth.'

And when at other places<sup>x</sup> he argues that infants, after they are baptized, are no longer to be counted either among the *infidels* or *catechumeni*, but among the *fideles* or *credentes*; yet still he means and explains himself, as he does here, 'That they are constituted *fideles*, 'not by that faith which consists in the will of believers, but by the 'sacrament of that faith.'

He does indeed hold that the Holy Spirit does do offices for the infant, and is in the infant: you see here his words, 'the regenerating spirit is one in those that bring the child, and in the child 'that is brought.' And in that part of the epistle which I left out because of the length, he says, 'Aqua exhibens forinsecus sacramentum gratiæ, et spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiæ, 'solvens vinculum culpæ,' &c. [§ 2.] 'The water affording outwardly 'the sacrament of the grace, and the spirit operating inwardly the 'benefit of the grace, loosing the bond of guilt,' &c., do regenerate. But he supposes the infants to be merely passive, and not to know, understand, or cooperate any thing themselves.

In his epistle to Dardanus, he says, 'It is a wonderful thing to 'consider how God dwells in some that know him not, and in some 'that do know him he does not dwell. For they who, when they 'know God, glorify him not as God, nor are thankful, do not belong 'to his temple; and infants sanctified by the sacrament of Christ, 'regenerated by the Holy Spirit, do belong to his temple; who, 'though they be regenerated, cannot yet by reason of their age 'know God.' And afterward, 'we affirm therefore that the Holy 'Spirit dwells in baptized infants though they know it not; for after 'the same manner they know him not, though he be in them, as 'they know not their own soul: the reason whereof which they cannot yet make use of, is in them as a spark raked up, which will 'kindle as they grow in years.' [§ 17.]

<sup>x</sup> De Peccatorum Meritis, lib. i. cap. 25, 33, &c. [Tom. x. p. 1. ed. Bened.]

<sup>y</sup> Epist. 57. [ed. Benedict. 187]

Some modern divines, especially of the Lutherans, have gone further, and do<sup>z</sup> maintain that infants have faith, and do believe after a certain manner; but not in the same way or manner that adult people do, whose faith comes by hearing, thought, meditation, understanding, &c., for they grant that infants have none of these: and what sort of faith is it that they have cannot, as they confess, be explained.

But a late philosophical divine of the church of Rome has outdone all. He has<sup>a</sup> acquainted us with the mechanism by which original sin is formed in the brain of an infant before he is born, and also how at baptism it is rectified; it is worth knowing.

It is thus: the mother has a sinful inclination and love to the world, pleasure, &c. There are tracks or traces in her brain running all this way. The child in her womb has by sympathy the same traces bred in his brain; so he has, before he is born, corrupt inclinations, and is a sinner. The difficulty is, how this is rectified at baptism.

For this, he supposes the child to have at the time of baptism one strong actual motion of love to God; and says, 'One single instant' is sufficient for the exercise of that act of love. And concupiscence 'is as it were mortified that moment.' And the strangest thing that he says is, 'It should not be thought strange, that I suppose it possible for children to love God with a love of choice at the time of their baptism. For since,' &c.

I think this learned author does somewhere<sup>b</sup> observe in his book, that 'men of learning are most subject to error:' and, 'that those' who are most hot in the search of truth are the men that lead us 'into infinite errors.' He gives several reasons for this, why such men do sometimes fall into greater mistakes than vulgar people. One more may perhaps be added to them; vulgar people, having no assistance from learning or philosophy, have nothing but common sense to trust to; so they generally keep close to that: they seldom allow themselves to maintain any opinion that is very remote from it. It was not these men that adventured first to teach the world, that that is in a proper sense the body of a man, which we see, when we have it in our hands, to be a piece of bread. On the contrary, they can hardly believe it, though the learned have taught them so.

<sup>z</sup> Chemnitii Examen Concilii Tridentini, pt. ii. de baptismo, § x. canon. 13. p. 334. edit. Francof. 1707.

<sup>a</sup> Malbranch, Treatise concerning the Search after Truth, translated by T. Taylor, fol. London, 1700. Illustrations on

ch. vii. of the 1st part of the second book. [Vol. i. p. 56. ii. p. 126, &c. The original French appeared in the year 1674. and a Latin version in 1685.]

<sup>b</sup> Book ii. pt. 2. ch. 4.

Neither was it for one of them to have found with all their search this truth, that an infant at the time of baptism loves God with a love of choice. They will hardly believe it of any infant at any time : much less when they see the child fast asleep at the time of baptism, or (as St. Austin observes<sup>c</sup> they often are) in a fit of crying and fretfulness all the while ; which, as he remarks, would be very sinful, if they had any understanding.

The aforesaid author says indeed, ‘ We ought not positively to affirm this, that children are justified by formal acts of their will.’ And he had reason ; for the Council of Trent suppose the contrary, when they say, ‘ If any one shall say that baptized infants, because they have not the act of believing, are not to be accounted *fideles*, &c., let him be anathema<sup>d</sup>.’ I suppose that church have at last learned not to hang any more millstones on the neck of their religion.

He says also, ‘ They that have treated of the effect of baptism in the ages past, have omitted the explaining the regeneration of infants by the actual motions of their heart ; not that they were induced by strong reasons to judge it impossible ; for their works do not shew they have ever so much as examined it.’ But St. Austin thought the evidence of sense to be a strong reason, when he says in the foresaid epistle to Dardanus ; ‘ If we should go about to prove by discourse, that infants, which as yet have no knowledge of human things, have knowledge of divine things, I am afraid we should seem to offer an affront to our senses ; when, let us say what we will, the evidence of the truth overpowers all the force of our talk<sup>e</sup>.’ He was not so hardy as either in this or the other sacrament, or in any other point to tack any thing to our faith that is contrary to our sense. And he goes on there to observe that infants, even then when they begin to talk, have so little sense or understanding, that if they should always keep to that pitch, they would be idiots.

Most of the pædobaptists go no further than St. Austin does ; they hold that God, by his Spirit, does at the time of baptism seal and apply to the infant that is there dedicated to him the promises of the covenant of which he is capable, viz. adoption, pardon of sin, translation from the state of nature to that of grace, &c. On which account the infant is said to be regenerated of [or by] the Spirit. Not that God does by any miracle at that time illuminate or convert the mind of the child. And for original sin, or the corruption of nature, they hold that God by his covenant does abolish the guilt

<sup>c</sup> Epist. 57. [ed. Benedict. 187.]

<sup>d</sup> Sess. 7. Can. de baptismo, 13.

<sup>e</sup> Epist. 57. [187.]



of it, receives the child to his mercy in Christ, and consigns to him by promise such grace as shall afterward, by the use of means, if he live, be sufficient to keep it under, but not wholly to extirpate it in this life. It is left as the subject of trial and of a continual Christian warfare. And this is the opinion of St. Austin<sup>f</sup> and of the ancients in general.

The Pelagians, on the other side, set their brains to work to find some actual sin in an infant. It was to their purpose: for since they took on them to deny original sin, and were pressed with that argument most of all, that the reason why infants are baptized, is for forgiveness of sin, they, for an evasion, would sometimes say, that their peevishness and fretful crying as soon as they are born, is a sin<sup>g</sup>, and they may be baptized for the forgiveness of that or such like sins. St. Austin explodes that rather more than the other; as being a thing that nobody would ever say but to serve an hypothesis: that ‘if they’ would calmly think of it, they would change their opinion; and if ‘they will not,’ says he, ‘we shall not have so ill an opinion of human sense, as to fear that any body will be persuaded by them.’ He takes nothing to be plainer than this, that a child before the use of reason can have neither actual sin nor actual faith.

Sect. 6. Out of St. Austin’s books *De Genesi ad literam*.

*De Genesi ad literam*, lib. 10.

I. St. Austin began and made a good progress in these books on Genesis long before Pelagius began to stir: but other work intervening, he did not finish and publish them till some time after. I do not observe any thing in them that seems to have any respect to the dispute with him. In this tenth book he handles the point of the origin of the human soul; whether every person’s soul be by immediate creation, or whether, as the body of a man is derived from the body of his parents, so his soul also be derived from their soul. He recites the arguments on both sides.

He observesh that the derivation of original sin from our first parents upon all their posterity is made by many an argument for the propagation of souls as well as bodies. They instanced in infants, concerning whom they argued thus: If we say they be derived from Adam, in respect of their bodies only, and not in respect of their souls, we must have a care that we do not either make God to be the author of sin, (if he put the soul into a body in which it must needs sin,) or else suffer it to be believed that there may be some soul,

<sup>f</sup> Contra Julianum, lib. vi. c. 5, 6, 7.

<sup>g</sup> August. de Peccatorum Meritis, lib. i.  
[cap. 35. § 65.]

<sup>h</sup> Cap. 11. [Op. tom. iii. p. 262. ed. Benedict.]



beside our Saviour Christ's, which has no need of the Christian grace to free it from sin. Which last is, say they, 'so contrary to the belief of the church, that parents run with their infants and little ones, to procure the grace of holy baptism. In whom if that bond of sin be loosed, which is of the body only, and not that which is of the soul too, it may well be asked what hurt it would do them, if at that age they should die without baptism; for if this sacrament be for the good of their body, and not of their soul too, they might be baptized after they were dead. But when as we see that the church universally observes this, to run with them while they are alive, and to help them while they are alive, lest when they are dead there be nothing to be done that can do them any good; we see not what else can be made of it, but that every infant is of Adam both as to his body and as to his soul.' [§ 19.]

And afterward<sup>i</sup>, this argument is carried on thus: 'What has the soul of an infant deserved, that it should be ruined in case it go out of the body without the sacrament of Christian baptism, if it has neither committed any sin of its own, nor be from that soul which first sinned in Adam?' [§ 22.]

The answer to that is<sup>k</sup> attempted to this purpose.

God puts the soul into an ill disposed body, that by ruling and keeping under the concupiscence thereof by the help of God's grace, it may procure the advantage of being, together with the body, changed into a better state at the resurrection than ever it could have had otherwise, viz. of living for ever with Christ. And to comply with the steps which the body makes by its gradual growth, the soul is at first possessed with a torpor, or incapacity of acting rationally; which does not do it much hurt, because it wears off by degrees as the body grows to perfection and the soul recovers from it, and arrives by God's help at a good degree of spiritual life. 'Now before the time that it can live according to the spirit, it has need of the sacrament of the Mediator, &c. For the punishment of original sin is taken away even in infancy by his sacrament; and without his help even a grown man will not keep under the concupiscence of the flesh, &c.——And the infant must be baptized while he is alive: otherwise it will prove a prejudice to his soul that it was linked with sinful flesh; for the soul of an infant having participated with that, cannot be addicted to the things of the spirit: for that affection does weigh it down even after it is parted from the body, unless while it is in the body it be expiated by the one sacrifice of the true priest.' [§ 24, 25.]

<sup>i</sup> Cap. 13.<sup>k</sup> Cap. 14.

*Reply.* ‘But how,’ says one, ‘if the parents take no care to have this done, either through infidelity or negligence?’

*Answer.* ‘That may be said as well of grown persons; for they may die suddenly, or they may fall sick in a place where nobody will help them to baptism.’

*Reply.* ‘But they have sins of their own that need forgiveness; and if they be not forgiven, a man cannot truly say they are punished undeservedly for the things they have by their own will committed in their lifetime. But why shall that soul be deprived of eternal life (in case nobody help the infant to baptism) to which the contagion it has received from sinful flesh cannot be imputed, if it be not propagated from the first sinful soul? For it was placed in the body, not by any sin, but by nature that ordered it so, and by God that placed it there. And if we say that the want of baptism will do it no hurt, then what good does it do to one that is helped to it, if there be no hurt to one that is not helped?’ [§ 26.]

‘Here,’ says St. Austin, ‘I confess that I never heard or read what they can answer for their side, who endeavour to maintain by scripture (as being for their opinion, or as not being against it) that new souls, and not such as are derived from the parents, are put into bodies.’ [§ 27.]

Yet he attempts in the following chapters another answer or two for those that held that opinion of the new creation of souls, (for himself, it is plain that he inclined most to the opinion of the propagation of them; only he was so modest as not to determine any thing;) but they are long, and, as he shews, insufficient.

‘One is, that God does not, in his providence, suffer any infant to die unbaptized, but such as he foresaw would have been wicked and impenitent, if they had lived. He shews how absurd it is to think that God condemns persons for sins which they never did or thought of; only he foresees they would have done them if they had lived.’

II. At last he comes to this end of his discourse on that subject. Having recited many arguments and answers on each side, he says<sup>m</sup>, ‘Having treated of this as largely as I could for the time, I should judge the force of the reasons and of the authorities to be equal, or almost equal on both sides; were it not that the opinion of those that think the souls to be derived from the parents has the advantage on the account of the baptism of infants; on which point what answer can be given them, I do not at present conceive. If God shall hereafter teach me any thing, and shall grant me an

‘opportunity to write it, I shall not grudge it to those that are  
‘studious of such things. But I now declare beforehand that the  
‘proof concerning infants must not be disregarded, so as that if the  
‘truth be on the other side, that should be passed over without an-  
‘swering. “Aut enim de hac re nihil quærendum est, ut sufficiat  
‘fidei nostræ scire nos quo pie vivendo venturi sumus, etsi nesciamus  
‘unde venerimus: Aut si non impudenter æstuat anima rationalis  
‘etiam hoc nosse de seipsa; absit perviciacia contendendi, assit dili-  
‘gentia requirendi, humilitas petendi, perseverantia pulsandi: Ut si  
‘nobis hoc expedire novit qui melius quam nos quid nobis expediat  
‘utique novit, det etiam hoc qui dat bona data filiis suis: Consuetudo  
‘tamen matris ecclesiæ in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda  
‘est, neque ullo modo superflua deputanda, nec omnino credenda nisi  
‘apostolica esset<sup>n</sup> traditio.” [§ 39.] For either nothing at all is to  
‘be inquired of this matter [the origin of the soul], and it must  
‘suffice our faith that we know whither we shall go, if we live well,  
‘without knowing whence we are sprung: or if it be no immodest  
‘ambition for a reasonable soul to desire to know this also concern-  
‘ing herself; putting away all obstinacy of contending, we must use  
‘diligence in inquiring, humility in asking, perseverance in knocking;  
‘that if he, who knows better than we what is fit for us, do judge  
‘this expedient, he would grant this also, as he grants good gifts to  
‘his children. But the custom of our mother the church in baptizing  
‘infants must not be disregarded, nor be accounted needless, nor  
‘believed to be other than a tradition [or order] of the apostles.’

The late bishop of Worcester<sup>o</sup> has restored the true reading of  
this place out of three ancient manuscripts at Oxford: for in those  
last words, ‘apostolica esse traditio,’ the word *esse* was in the printed  
editions *esset*, which addition of one letter had wonderfully perverted  
the sense: for as it stood so, it was to be translated ‘is not to be  
‘disregarded; nor to be accounted needless, nor to be believed at all,  
‘if it were not a tradition of the apostles.’ Which makes St. Austin  
go forward and backward, and forward again in the same breath.  
But this amendment makes it a coherent sentence, agreeable to the  
scope of the place, and conformable to what St. Austin says in several  
other places: for example, it is the same phrase with that which I  
recited, sect. 4. § 3. of this chapter, ‘Non nisi auctoritate apostolica  
‘traditum rectissime creditur,’ ‘is most reasonably believed to be no

<sup>n</sup> [The Benedictine Editors read *esset*; but see, below, Dr. Wall’s remarks on the point.]

<sup>o</sup> Bishop Stillingfleet; in a Rational

Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion, being a vindication of archbishop Laud’s Conference, pt. i. ch. iv. § 10. fol. London, 1665.



‘other than a thing delivered [or ordered] by the authority of the ‘apostles.’ So that though it was not fitting to alter the reading without the authority of some manuscripts, yet as soon as the alteration is proposed, it presently appears to be the true reading.

The papists made great use of this place as it stood so printed, to shew that some points of faith (for they make this difference about the time of baptism to concern a point of faith) can be proved only by tradition, and not by scripture, and consequently that the scripture is no complete rule of faith. Archbishop Laud managing the defence of the protestant doctrine to the contrary, says<sup>v</sup>, ‘It is true ‘Bellarmine presses a main place out of St. Austin, and he urges it ‘hard;’ meaning this place. But it might have been observed, even before the true reading was discovered, that the words so put together are nonsense. For if St. Austin had said, the doctrine of infant baptism were not to be believed if it were not a tradition of the apostles, it had been sense indeed, and something to their purpose, though not true. But to say ‘the custom of the church in baptizing ‘infants were not to be believed unless it were a tradition of the ‘apostles,’ is not sense; because the custom was seen and not believed. Which is another proof that the print was erroneous, and that the foresaid amendment is the true reading.

The antipædobaptists on the contrary served themselves of this place to prove, as by St. Austin’s confession, that the practice of infant-baptism depended only on tradition: from whence they concluded that it was not to be received at all. But whosoever reads these two passages of St. Austin that I have been comparing, will see, that he does not by the words *traditum* and *traditio*, mean a doctrine that had been taught by word of mouth only, and had no foundation in the written word. He plainly expresses the contrary in the former place: for he speaks to this purpose; if any one, beside the practice of the universal church, do require divine authority in this matter: first, that practice having not been ordered by any council, but having been ever in use in the church, it is most reasonable to believe that it must have been ordered by the apostles themselves. And, secondly, it may be proved from scripture also, by the analogy that baptism bears to circumcision, &c.

And whereas the Latin phrase runs, *Non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum*; that does not signify that it was established no other way than by a verbal order; but that it came not in by any lesser or later authority than that of the apostles; not by any general council, &c.



It is true, his arguing in that place does suppose, that though it could not have been proved from scripture, yet if it could be proved to have been ordered by the apostles by word in their lifetime, that ought to have satisfied any one. And so no doubt it ought, provided the proof were clear. But this does not help the argument of the papists, who would have the consent of the church at present to be a sufficient proof of a doctrine. For how hard or how easy soever it was at that time for the church to know certainly the practice of the apostles, by a tradition which needed to be traced back but for three hundred years; it is utterly impossible now to trace back a tradition for 1600 years, unless it be recorded in scripture, or in those ancient writings nigh the time of the apostles: which, I am sure, the pope's supremacy and worship of images, &c. are not; whatever this that I am writing of be.

Sect. 7. Out of St. Austin's letter to St. Hierome. *Augustini Epist.* 28. [in edit. Benedict. 166.]

§ I. This letter was written after the Pelagian opinions began to be talked of. He mentions them there: 'For you are,' says he, 'none of those who now begin to prate new things, and say, there is no guilt derived from Adam, which is by baptism forgiven in an infant.' Therefore the quotations out of it ought not to be placed in this chapter, were it not that here they may be despatched more briefly; as being exactly to the same purpose as those I last quoted.

St. Austin, having, as we see, in his books on Genesis so treated of the origin of the soul, as to leave it in suspense how it is that we came by our souls; and being still thoughtful of that matter, and coming to know that St. Hierome had wrote something on this subject in his Epistle to Marcellinus, and in a piece of his against Rufinus' Apology; wherein he had spoke in favour of that opinion which makes new souls to be created every day by God for every new infant, calling that 'the opinion of the church;' and of the other opinion which supposes the soul to be propagated from the parent, had said, 'That it was the opinion of Tertullian and Apollinaris, and many of the western Christians, that as the body is generated of the body, so the soul is of the soul, and subsists in a way much like to that of brute creatures.' He had a mind to see how St. Hierome could free that opinion (which he seemed to embrace) of the new creation of souls, from the objection that lay against it from the propagation of original sin from father to son. And therefore he writes to him, though he lived above a thousand miles off, to desire him to explain that difficulty.

And for fear of provoking him, (for he was a hasty man, and

St. Austin had felt the sharpness of his style in an angry fit before,) he writes in a most humble strain, and with great deference to his learning and judgment, condescending in his letter to such a degree, even of submission, as never was usual, and may seem indecent in a bishop writing to a presbyter, entreating him to instruct and satisfy him in such things as he was ignorant of, that he might be able to instruct others.

He first sets down some things which he knew of himself, that St. Hierome might have the less trouble in satisfying him of the other in which he was to seek. The things that he took for certain concerning the nature of man's soul were,

1. That the soul is immortal, and does not die when it goes out of the body. This he speaks of as a thing universally known, and agreed.

2. That it is not a part of God. Some philosophers had taught that. But it was rejected by all Christians, except some Priscillians, Manichees, and I know not who.

3. That the soul is immaterial, he says, is a thing not easily to be proved to some people; but for his part he is satisfied that it is. This, I suppose, he says, that he may not seem to come too near Tertullian, whom St. Hierome had mentioned, and who had held that not the soul only, but God also has a body.

4. That the soul is fallen into sin, not by any fault of God, not by any necessity either from God or from its own primitive nature, but by its own will; and that it cannot recover itself but by the grace of Jesus Christ. That there is in all mankind no soul but wants his redemption.

5. 'That every soul that departs the body, at what age soever, without the grace of the Mediator, and the sacrament thereof, will be in punishment, and will at the last judgment receive its body to punishment: but if after the human generation, which is from Adam, it be regenerated in Christ, and belong to his communion; it will have, after the death of the body, rest, and also will receive its body again to glory.

'These are,' says he, 'things that I steadfastly believe concerning the soul. Now I entreat you, hear the things that I want to know; and do not despise me, lest He despise you, who for our sakes vouchsafed to be despised.'

'Quæro, ubi contraxerit anima reatum, quo trahitur in condemnationem, etiam infantis morte præventi, si ei per sacramentum, quo etiam parvuli baptizantur, Christi gratia non subvenerit.'

[Cap. iii. § 6.] 'I ask where the soul contracted that guilt, by

‘ which it is brought to condemnation, (even the soul of an infant surprised with death,) if the grace of Christ do not relieve it by the sacrament whereby infants are baptized.’

In the process of the letter he takes for granted that St. Hierome’s opinion is, that a soul is new created for every infant ; and says, ‘ I am very willing to be of that opinion too, but I am not as yet of it.—Therefore I entreat you, teach me what I shall teach, and hold, and tell me ; if particular souls be made for every particular infant born, when it is that they do sin in the infant so as to need forgiveness, &c.—Since we must neither say of God, that he either forces the souls to become sinful, or punishes them being innocent ; nor can deny that those souls even of infants which depart the body, without Christ’s sacrament, do go to any other than condemnation : I beseech you how can that opinion be defended, which holds that the souls do not come all of them from that one soul of the first man ; but that as he had one made for him, so there is a particular one made for each infant.’ [Cap. iv. § 10.]

He then recites some other objections that some people made against this opinion ; as, that God rested the seventh day from making any new thing. And, that God, when he saw an infant begotten in whoredom, would never create a soul for that, &c. And he says, that he himself could easily answer all those objections ; and adds,

‘ But when I come to the pains suffered by infants, I am, I assure you, brought to great straits, and cannot find any thing at all to answer : I mean not only those pains which after this life do attend that condemnation to which they must go, if they die without the sacrament of the Christian grace, but those which in this life we see with our eyes, and it grieves us to see ; which if I should go to count, I should sooner want time than instances. They languish with sickness, they are tortured with pains, they are afflicted with hunger and thirst, maimed in their limbs, deprived of their senses, tormented with unclean spirits.’ He afterwards asks, ‘ Whether we are to think that as the herd of swine was given to the devils to do their pleasure with them, so God hath left infants to their will without a just cause.’ [Cap. vi. § 16.]

Afterward, in trying every side of this argument, to see if there be any escaping the force of it, he speaks of the necessity there was to believe that infants cannot be saved without Christ, and that they have not the benefits of Christ consigned to them, but by baptism : and having mentioned that saying of the apostle, *As in*

*Adam all die—so in Christ shall all be quickened*, and some other texts, he says:

‘And therefore whosoever shall tell us that any one can be quickened in the resurrection of the dead except by Christ, is to be abhorred as the bane of our common faith. And whosoever shall say that infants shall be quickened in Christ, which die without partaking of his sacrament, does both contradict the apostle’s preaching, and also *totam condemnat ecclesiam*, condemns the whole church, in which men do hasten and run with their infants to be baptized, doubtless for that reason, because they believe that otherwise they cannot be quickened in Christ. And he that is not quickened in Christ must remain in that condemnation of which the apostle speaks, *By one man’s offence judgment came on all to condemnation*. To which condemnation that infants are born liable, *et omnis credit ecclesia*, both all the church believes, and you, in your books against Jovinian, and in your Exposition on the Prophet Jonah, have most orthodoxly proved, as I said before; and I suppose in other places of your works, which I have not read, or do not at present remember.’

‘Now I would know what is the cause of this condemnation. For if new souls be made for every infant, I cannot see any sin of the souls at that age, and I do not believe that God will condemn any which he sees to have no sin.’ [Cap. vii. § 21.]

After another paragraph, in which he quotes a passage out of the letter of St. Cyprian, which I produced above<sup>9</sup>, he says, ‘There must be a reason given why souls that are new created in all that are born are condemned; for that they are condemned if they so die, both the holy scripture and the holy church is witness. Therefore this opinion of the creation of new souls, if it do not oppose this most established faith, shall be mine; and if it do, do not let it be yours.’ [§ 25.]

Then he shews the absurdity of those who answer all this by saying, that the soul sinned in some former state before it came into the body.

He concludes with protesting that he could wish that that opinion of St. Hierome might be shewn to be true: he liked it so well in other respects, were it not for this objection. He mentions his prayers to God that the doubt in which he was of this matter might, if it were God’s will, be cleared to him by St. Hierome’s means: but owns he must have patience if God refuse him this request. And of the several ways of clearing it, says,



‘Antequam sciam, quænam earum potius eligenda sit, hoc me non  
 ‘temere sentire profiteor, eam quæ vera est non adversari robus-  
 ‘tissimæ ac fundatissimæ fidei, qua Christi ecclesia nec parvulos  
 ‘homines recentissime natos a damnatione credit, nisi per gratiam  
 ‘nominis Christi, quam in suis sacramentis commendavit, posse  
 ‘liberari.’ [§ 28.]

‘Before I know which of them is to be chosen, this I know ; that  
 ‘that of them which is the true, does not oppose that most firm and  
 ‘established faith, by which the church of Christ believes that even  
 ‘the new born little ones of mankind cannot be freed from con-  
 ‘demnation, but by the grace of the name of Christ, which he has  
 ‘commended to us in his sacraments.’

St. Hierome in his answer<sup>r</sup> to this letter did not think fit to enter  
 upon a discussion of this question of the origin of the soul ; but an-  
 swered in short, that it was ‘better for each to abound in his own  
 ‘sense,’ than by their disputes of this matter to give advantage to  
 their common enemies the Pelagians, who said there was no original  
 sin at all. ‘We,’ says he, ‘do indeed argue this matter for in-  
 ‘struction’s sake ; but our adversaries, and especially the heretics,  
 ‘when they see us of different opinions, will slander us as if we did  
 ‘it out of envy.—Let us rather do our endeavour that that  
 ‘most pernicious heresy may be extinguished, which always pretends  
 ‘repentance, that it may have opportunity of teaching in the church,  
 ‘lest if it should declare itself openly, it should be expelled from  
 ‘thence, and so die.’

And St. Austin, though he reckoned that in the other way of ex-  
 plaining the origin of the soul, which was embraced in the western  
 church, viz. that it, as well as the body, is begotten by the parents,  
 it was much more easy to account for the guilt of original sin, yet  
 never was positive. Neither did he publish this letter, as he says  
 himself<sup>s</sup>, so long as St. Hierome lived : ‘because if he had written  
 ‘any answer, they might be better published together. But when  
 ‘he was dead, I published it,’ says he, ‘that he that reads it may  
 ‘take advice, either not to make any inquiry at all how the soul is  
 ‘given to those that are born ; or else in so very obscure a matter to  
 ‘admit of such a solution of the question as is not contrary to those  
 ‘plain points which the catholic faith owns concerning infants, that  
 ‘they will doubtless be condemned if they be not regenerated in  
 ‘Christ.’

The opinion of St. Hierome, that the soul is by immediate creation,

<sup>r</sup> Epist. 94.

<sup>s</sup> Retractat., lib. ii. cap. 45. [tom. i. p. 57. edit. Bened.]

has since prevailed to be almost the universal opinion in the west, as well as the east.

II. But the mechanic philosophy that is lately come in vogue has set some men upon an attempt to frame an hypothesis about the nature of the soul, which I cannot say is of St. Austin's side, because it carries the matter a great deal further than he would have it. It makes the soul not to be any thing really distinct from the body : but only such a disposition of the parts of the body as makes it fit to live, move, remember, think, &c., all which they think may be done by a system of matter, provided there be skill enough in the contriver ; and they refer us to the infinite art of God. So the old definition of Aristotle is come in request again, that it is nothing but *actus corporis organici*.

One may explain their meaning best by a thing that is more obviously apprehended. The disposition of the wheels in a clock, such as will make it go, may, for explication sake, be called the soul of the clock. And when the wheels are so rusty or broken that it will no longer go, the soul of it is gone ; and a skilful artificer that can mend it, and make it go better than before, gives it a resurrection.

But there is in this sense no notion of a soul existing in a separate condition ; and accordingly these men believe no such thing.

The antipædobaptists have been much inclined to an opinion of man's soul, that it either dies with the body, and has no existence ; or falls asleep, as some term it, and has no sense till the resurrection. It is an opinion that took footing early among them in Germany. For Calvin, in his work called *Psychopannychia*, written 1534, sayst,<sup>t</sup> ' Some people in Arabia were the first authors of this opinion ; who ' said the soul died with the body, and rose again at the day of ' judgment : and afterward John bishop of Rome held it ; whom the ' school [or academy] of Paris forced to recant. And after it had ' been laid to sleep for some ages, it was lately revived by some of ' the anabaptist sort.' And in his *Instructio adversus Anabaptistas*<sup>u</sup>, written 1544, he says, ' They all commonly hold that souls separate ' from the body do sleep without any sense or understanding till the ' day of judgment : or, that the soul of a man is his life, which ' ceases when he dies, till he be raised again.'

Some of the antipædobaptists do still hold the same opinion, but not all.

It is a wonder how they, of all people, came to fall into this

<sup>t</sup> In præfatione. [Calvini Opera, tom. viii. p. 335.]

<sup>u</sup> Art. 7. [Opera, tom. viii. p. 355.]

opinion. For since they do many of them deny original sin; the other opinion, which the generality of Christians do now embrace, (viz. that the soul of each infant is a spiritual substance, anew created by God, capable of existing without a body, but put by him into the body,) is much fitter for their purpose. For, as St. Austin here shews, the opinion of original sin derived to us all in our infancy from Adam our first parent, is much more easy to conceive on a supposal that we have nothing in us but what is propagated from the seed of Adam, than it is upon a supposal that God creates a soul out of nothing, which can subsist of itself, and puts it into the body for a time. For how comes that soul to have a guilt, derived to it from the sin of Adam, which has no succession at all from Adam, but is now lately created by God? It is indeed put into a body derived from Adam. But sin is of the soul rather than of the body. And besides, it was not its own fault or choice that it was put into a sinful body.

So that the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists, holding these opinions thus cross-wise, do make a controversy which in this particular looks something like a dispute<sup>x</sup> mentioned by St. Chrysostom, that was managed in his time between a Christian and a Greek; but so unskilfully, that he says, ‘the Greek said what the Christian should have said; and the Christian said what the Greek should have said.’

It is however a requisite property of sincerity, to declare and profess in any point what we think truest, though the other side do seem to suit better with our other tenets. The contrary is to serve, not the truth, but our hypothesis.

I am afraid we must all sit down in our disquisition concerning the origin of our souls, content with the comfort with which St. Austin here supports himself; that we know, if we live well, whither we shall go after this state, without knowing how we came into it. For the explication that the schools have since added to this matter, with their *creando infunditur et infundendo creatur*, has put some new words into our mouths, but no new sense into our heads.

I shall here so far trespass upon the proposed method of quoting the passages, wherein the Pelagians were concerned by themselves, as to rehearse here what St. Austin said a great while after on this subject. The Pelagians, in a letter which eighteen bishops of their party wrote and published by common consent, picked out several things that seemed absurd in the doctrine of the catholics; and among the rest, this: that they proved the propagation of sin by

<sup>x</sup> In 1. ad Corinth. Hom. 3. [§ 4. p. 20. Op. tom. x.]

the propagation of souls, or held them as points that would stand or fall together. St. Austin, in his answer to that part of their letter says<sup>v</sup> :

‘ They add here, to cloud or confound the matter, an unnecessary question of the origin of souls : to the end that by disturbing things that are plain by the obscurity of other matters, they may seek an opportunity of lying hid. For they say that we maintain the propagation of sin together with the propagation of souls ; which where or when they have heard in the speeches, or read in the books, of those that defend the catholic faith, I know not. For though I do meet with some things written by catholics on this subject ; yet that was before the defence of the truth was undertaken against these men, and not in answer to any thing of theirs.

‘ But this I say, that original sin is so plain by the scriptures, and that it is forgiven to infants in the laver of regeneration, is so confirmed by the antiquity and authority of the catholic faith, so notorious by the practice of the church ; that whatsoever is disputed, inquired, or affirmed of the origin of the soul, if it be contrary to this, cannot be true.’

This was his constant tenet, that though he inclined to one side of the question, concerning the origin of the soul, yet he would not have the doctrine of original sin to depend upon that.

III. There is one thing more observable from these two last passages of St. Austin, viz. that there was no such thing then used as private baptism of children in houses, except in cases of the greatest extremity ; and that even sick children were carried to the church, if it were possible. For it is of such that he says, ‘ men do hasten and run with them to be baptized while they are alive, lest when they are dead there be nothing to be done,’ &c. It was to the church that they ran, where there were large fonts or baptisteries, in which infants or grown persons might be put into the water. And it has since been decreed in a general council in Trullo, Can. 59, that baptisms shall not be in private chapels, but in the public church.

This was so generally observed from the time that churches were built, till of late days, that we read of many kings’ sons, and kings themselves, converted to the Christian faith, that received their baptism in the church. Whereas nowadays persons of much lower rank take the state upon them to expect it to be brought home to their children, though they are well. And there they put a great contempt upon it, by making it a formal ceremony, subservient to their belly-

<sup>v</sup> Lib. iii. contra duas Epist. Pelagian. cap. x. § 26.



cheer, and a drinking feast; little regard being given to the holy sacrament, or the prayers used thereat.

In cases of urgent extremity the ancients did indeed baptize any where; in the house, in the bed, &c., rather than the party should die without it. I mean to give by and by<sup>z</sup> several proofs of that. But they never did so but in such cases.

The church of England allows of baptism by a minister in private houses in cases of necessity; but gives positive order, that it be not used except in case of danger of the child's death; and that such a child, if it live, be brought to the church, and his baptism declared there. And some bishops and curates of the said church do shew a zeal to have this order, which has of late been much neglected, put again in due execution. But others of them seem more indifferent about it. And in most places it is found a difficult thing to overcome that lazy and irreverent custom, which took such deep footing among the people in the late disorderly times.

There never was a more capricious change made by any sort of people in any matter of religion than the English presbyterians have made in this point. No longer ago than queen Elizabeth's time, they made it one of their objections against the English Common Prayer Book, that it gave any allowance for this private baptism at all. They pleaded, 'that it is not lawful either to preach the word, ' nor to minister the sacraments in private corners: that they ought ' not to be but where the church is; and that the church ought not ' to assemble (if it be not letted by persecution) but in open places: ' that John baptized openly: that Austin, although he were of that ' mind, that children could not be saved without baptism, yet in the ' time of necessity (as it is called) he does not allow either of bap- ' tism in private houses or by women; but when there was danger, ' the women hasted to carry the children unto the church.'

These and more such like pleas, Cartwright used in his disputation with archbishop Whitgift. 'And so you see,' says he, 'those whom ' you charge slanderously with conventicles, are fain to glaze up the ' windows that you open to secret and private conventicles<sup>a</sup>.' And having mentioned 'the orders that God hath set, that it should be ' done in the congregation, and by the minister of the Gospel,' he adds this rigid and presbyterian expression; 'And I will further say, ' That although the infants which die without baptism should be ' assuredly damned, (which is most false,) yet ought not the orders ' which God hath set in his church to be broken after this sort.

<sup>z</sup> Part ii. ch. 9. § 2.

<sup>a</sup> See Whitgift's Defence of the Answer

to the Admonition, [fol. Lond. 1574.]  
Tract. ii. ch. 1. div. 8.

‘ For as the salvation of men ought to be dear unto us ; so the glory of God, which consisteth in that his orders be kept, ought to be much more dear<sup>b</sup>.’

Whitgift, on the other side, shews that the book did not say any thing of baptism by women or by laymen ; he pleads for no more than this, ‘ That upon extreme necessity of sickness, peril of death, and such like, the curate may be sent for, or some other minister that may sooner be come by,’ to do it in the house. But he is not allowed that.

And yet how strangely have these men since ran into the other extreme ! When they came to have the ordering of matters in the church, they (though contrary to the rules of their own Directory<sup>c</sup>) gratified the humour of the people in this matter far more than ever the church of England had done. If their religion had been parliamentary, as the papists slander all our religion to be ; they could not have taken a more violent swing from one side to the other.

At present they and their people make this house-baptism the most ordinary way of administering that sacrament, be the child sick or well : and in London and other places, where any of them are, a clergyman of the church of England cannot, if he would, bring his people to the observation of the foresaid order of the church ; because if any humoursome man or woman of his parish have a mind to have their child, though in never so good health, baptized in the house, and he deny them, the next thing is, they in a pet send for one of these men, who are always ready to do it.

There are no orders of the church that do come in process of time to be more grossly and universally abused, than those that begin first to be dispensed with for the state and character of the persons concerned in them. This was first granted as a privilege of kings, or kings’ sons, as appears by the Decretals<sup>d</sup> of Clement the Fifth ; and by the council of Cologne, where it is ordained that none but they should be baptized at home. Afterward it came, I suppose, 1310. to be allowed to noblemen, and so to other rich men.

<sup>b</sup> [Whitgift’s Defence of the Answer, &c. Tract. ix. ch. 3, 4, 5.]

<sup>c</sup> [The ‘Directory for the publique worship of God throughout the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland,’ together with an ordinance of parliament, ‘for the taking away of the book of Common Prayer,’ a work published by authority, in the year 1644, gives the following orders respecting baptism : ‘Nor is it to be administered in private places, or privately, but in the place of public

‘worship, and in the face of the congregation, where the people may most conveniently see and hear.’ p. 39, edit. 4to. 1644.]

<sup>d</sup> [See Decretal. Clementin. lib. iii. tit. 15. de Baptismo. The words of the text are, ‘nisi regum vel principum liberi extiterint,’ where follows a long and most puerile gloss upon the word *principes*, shewing that it might mean *God*, an *angel*, the *pope*, a *lord mayor*, a *bee*, a *bird*, or the *devil*.]

And as everybody affects the name and state of gentility, they think themselves hardly dealt with, if they be accounted in this matter inferior to such or such of their neighbours.

This, and many other instances of like nature that might be given, should teach the clergy to take care how they make any beginning of breaking that rule of scripture given by St. James<sup>e</sup> against any respect of persons to be shewn in church matters; for if you once begin, there is no stop to be made afterward. Therefore the synod  
1485. of Aix determined, ‘That no curate or other priest should, under pain of excommunication, go to any house, not even of a nobleman, to administer baptism, except in case of necessity; and that no case should be taken to be of necessity, but when the child’s life is in danger<sup>f</sup>.’

## CHAP. XVI.

### *Quotations out of some Councils of Carthage, before the Pelagian Controversy.*

§ I. THE most ancient councils of Carthage, as well as of other  
297. churches, are not recorded in the volumes of councils.  
(A. D. 397.) The custom of registering the acts of councils, and bringing them into volumes, began later. One of the first of all the councils of Carthage, and (except one or two) of the most ancient in all Christendom, since the times of the apostles, of which we have any remains, was that of sixty-six bishops under St. Cyprian in the year after the apostles 150; which resolved the question whether infant-baptism might be administered on the first or second day after the birth, or must be deferred till the eighth. But the account of that is given before at large in chap. vi. Those that I mean to recite here are of such as are set down in the common volumes, and were about the latter end of the fourth century.

And of these Dr. Cave<sup>s</sup> and others have observed, that there is great obscurity and difficulty in assigning the very year on which they were held; and some confusion by reason of the carelessness or mistakes of the collectors, who have sometimes inserted into one council some of the canons that have been made in another. I shall not in these nice matters pretend to be wiser than other men. But the first canon that I shall quote carries in itself a plain and undoubted indication of the year in which it was enacted.

<sup>e</sup> Chap. ii. 1, 2, 3.

<sup>f</sup> Laurentii Bochelli *Decreta Ecclesiae Gallicanae*. [fol. Paris, 1609: again, *ibid*.

1621. Lib. ii. tit. 3. de Baptismo, cap. 77.]

<sup>g</sup> *Historia Literaria*, part. ii. p. 132. [Tom. i. p. 369, edit. Oxon, 1740.]

It is the forty-eighth canon of that council of Carthage which is generally called the third. About the time when this council was held, the schism of the Donatists began to break apace; and those who had been brought up in it came over in great numbers to the communion of the church. This party of men, as I shewed before<sup>h</sup>, differed nothing from the catholics in any point either of doctrine or of ceremonies or of sacraments; but only they accounted that party in Africa which was called the catholic church, impure by reason of some ill men that were among them, or by reason that some of the ministers thereof derived their ordination from bishops that had, as was said, been guilty of apostasy in the former times of persecution: and all that came over to them from the catholics they had been wont to baptize anew, as coming out of an impure church.

Now the bishops of this council debated among themselves how far it was expedient to admit any that returned from this schism to the church into holy orders. And as for those who having been once baptized in the catholic church, did, after they came to years, revolt to the Donatists, and were baptized by them; they agreed that such, upon their return to the church, might be admitted to lay-communion, but never to bear any office in the church. But the case of those that had been born among the Donatists, and had been in their infancy baptized by them, and after they came to years of discretion disliked the schism and came over to the church, seemed very different.

Concerning these they could not come to any resolution at the present: and therefore they agreed that the advice of two of the most noted neighbouring churches should be asked in that matter; and they made a canon in these words:

*Concilii Carthag. tertii* Can. 48. [tom. ii. p. 1072, 1177,  
edit. Labbe, tom. iii. p. 892. edit. Mansi.]

‘ De Donatistis, placuit ut consulamus fratres et consacerdotes  
‘ nostros Siricium et Simplicianum, de solis infantibus qui bapti-  
‘ zantur penes eosdem, ne [leg. an] quod suo non fecerunt iudicio,  
‘ cum ad ecclesiam Dei salubri proposito fuerint conversi, parentum  
‘ illos error impediatur, ne provehantur sacri altaris ministri.’

‘ In reference to the Donatists, it is resolved that we do ask the  
‘ advice of our brethren and fellow bishops Siricius and Simplicianus,  
‘ concerning those only who are in infancy baptized among them;  
‘ whether in that which they have not done by their own judgment,  
‘ the error of their parents shall hinder them, that when they by a



‘ wholesome purpose shall be converted to the church of God, they  
‘ may not be promoted to be ministers of the holy altar.’

The collection that is called *Concilium Africanum* has this same canon, *capitulum* 14. Siricius was at this time bishop of Rome, and Simplicianus of Milan. So that, as I said, this canon gives us from  
297. itself a clear proof of the year when it was made, viz. anno  
(A. D. 397.) Dom. 397; for Simplicianus was not made bishop of Milan till the beginning of this year, when he came into the room of St. Ambrose, who died then: and in the beginning of the next year Siricius bishop of Rome died.

II. The answer of these two bishops seems to have been in favour  
301. of those concerning whom their opinion was asked; for  
(A. D. 401.) four years after, the council of Carthage determines the point absolutely, that such persons may, if there be occasion, be promoted to the ministry. The canon, leaving out the digressions, is this:

*Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ*, Can. 57. [see Concil. edit. Binii, tom. i. p. 636.—edit. Reg. Paris. tom. iv. p. 528. et iterum, p. 598.—tom. ii. p. 1084. ed. Labb.]

Aurelius bishop of Carthage speaks in the council, and says,

‘ Superiori concilio statutum esse mecum recognoscit unanimitas  
‘ vestra, ut hi qui apud Donatistas parvuli baptizati sunt, nondum  
‘ scire valentes erroris eorum interitum, et posteaquam ad ætatem  
‘ rationis capacem pervenerunt, agnita veritate, &c.——recepti  
‘ sunt;——sine dubio ad officium clericatus tales esse applicandos,  
‘ et maxime in tanta rerum necessitate, nullus est qui non concedat.

‘ Quanquam nonnulli ejusdem sectæ clerici, cum plebibus atque  
‘ honoribus suis ad nos transire desiderent, &c.——Sed hoc majori  
‘ fratrum supradictorum considerationi dimittendum censeo.——  
‘ Tantum de his qui infantes baptizati sunt satagimus, ut nostræ, si  
‘ placet, in iisdem ordinandis consentiant voluntati,’ &c.

‘ You remember that in a former council it was resolved, that  
‘ they who were, in their infancy, before they were able to under-  
‘ stand the mischief of that error, baptized among the Donatists, and  
‘ when they came to age of understanding, acknowledging the truth,  
‘ &c.——they were received by us.——All will grant that such may  
‘ undoubtedly be promoted to church offices, especially in times of  
‘ so great need.

‘ Some that have been teachers in that sect would come over with  
‘ their congregations, if they might have the same places among us,  
‘ &c.——But this I leave to a further consideration of our bre-  
‘ thren, &c.——Only that they will consent to our determination,

‘ that such as were baptized by them in infancy may be admitted ‘ to orders.’

This shews plainly that the Donatists as well as Catholics baptized in infancy : only those that had been baptized by the church party, whether in infancy or at full age, they would not receive into their sect without giving them a new baptism ; because they judged baptism given in an impure church was void, though it were given in the right form, and to a subject never so capable : for which the church charged them with the crime of anabaptism, or rebaptization. And they were about this time reduced, and came over to the church.

III. There are added in the old copies of the said third council of Carthage, anno Dom. 397, some canons, of which it is said, ‘ it is ‘ not certain whether they belong properly to the first, or second, or ‘ third council.’ One of them<sup>i</sup> is for abating to poor people the fees that were usually paid to the minister at the baptizing of a child. But it being accounted by the most learned critics to be of a later date, and to have been crowded in here by Mercator, I shall omit the recital of it.

IV. The next of the councils of Carthage, in which we find any mention of infant-baptism, is that which is vulgarly called the fifth, and was celebrated three years after, viz. anno Dom. 400. In which there is a canon that makes provision for the case of such as had been carried away captive in their infancy into the country of the barbarians, and when they were ransomed, there was none of their friends left alive that could certainly tell whether they had been baptized before their carrying away or not. Such persons, or their surviving friends for them, were in great perplexity and doubt whether it were fit that they should be baptized after their ransom. For if they were baptized before their captivity, then this would be to baptize them twice ; which was looked on by all Christians, except the Marcionites, to be a great profanation of the sacrament. And if they were not baptized before, then not to do it now were to let them die without any baptism at all. The words of the canon are these :

*Concilii Carthaginensis Quinti, Canon 6.<sup>k</sup>*

‘ Placuit de infantibus, quoties non inveniuntur certissimi testes, ‘ qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubitatione testentur, neque ipsi sunt ‘ per ætatem idonei de traditis sibi sacramentis respondere ; absque

<sup>i</sup> Labbei Concil. [see this canon in tom. iii. p. 511. Collect. Reg. Paris.—tom. iii. p. 892. edit. Mansi.] Item, Carranza summa Concil. Concil. Carthag. Tertium ; Item

Gratian. q. 1.

<sup>k</sup> [See Binii edit. tom. i. p. 637. Collect. reg. Paris. tom. iv. p. 536 et 609.—edit. Mansi, tom. iii. pp. 926 et 969.]

‘ullo scrupulo hos esse baptizandos: ne ista trepidatio eos faciat sacramentorum purgatione privari. Hinc enim legati Maurorum fratres nostri consuluerunt,’ &c.

‘It is resolved concerning infants of whose having been baptized there are no positive witnesses that can give certain evidence, and they themselves are not capable to give any account of that sacrament having been administered to them, by reason of their age; that such be without any scruple baptized: lest that scruple do cause them to go without the cleansing of the sacrament. For our brethren that come from the Mauritians have asked our advice on this question, who do ransom many such from the barbarians,’ &c.

I set this council at anno 400, that is, the year after the apostles 300. And so do all late writers that speak of it set it then, or within a year or two of that time. Which I note, because Binius and some other old copies give it a date that may seem at first sight very absurd and inconsistent, worded thus, ‘Circa tempora Anastasii Papæ post consulatum Cæsarii et Attici, sexto kalendas Junii habitum, æra 438.’ ‘Held about the time of pope Anastasius, after the consulship of Cæsarius and Atticus, six days before the kalends of June, in the year 438.’ But the consulship of Cæsarius and Atticus was in the year 397. And Anastasius came into the see anno 398, and lived but four years. And Aurelius, whose name is among the bishops that subscribed this council, could not live to 438. But all this is reconciled by taking that æra 438 not for the year of Christ, but for the year of that æra which the Spaniards call *æra Augusti*, reckoned from the time of the senate’s confirming the acts of the triumvirate, which was (as Petavius, Rat. Temp. pt. ii. cap. 3. shews) just thirty-eight years before the Christian æra. So that this, instead of disturbing, does confirm the date of anno Dom. 400.

So that Baronius, Spondanus, Dr. Cave, &c., place it anno 398. Justellus and cardinal Perron, anno 401. Schelstratius, this year 400. All in the time of Anastasius. And another thing which confirms its being on one of these years, is the matter of the last canon of it: and yet the different understanding of some words of that canon causes the difference in placing it of a year or two. The canon is this; ‘Resolved, that a petition be made to the most renowned emperors, that all relics of idolatry, not only in images, but in all places, whether groves or trees, be altogether destroyed.’

Now all agree, that on the year 399 was the most general overthrow of the heathen temples, in all the empire, but especially at

Carthage, and in all Africa. St. Austin gives<sup>1</sup> the account of it, which is very remarkable.

The heathens had had a tradition very rife among them, that the Christian religion should last but 365 years, to be reckoned from the beginning of it. They depended upon an oracle for this. The oracle had said, that Peter the apostle being a skilful magician, had, by killing and cutting in pieces a child of a year old, and burying the limbs of it with certain magical rites, raised so strong a charm for the success of the Christian religion, that it must now last for so many years as the child was days old: but when that time was expired they should see it presently come to an end. And one may perceive by St. Austin's words, that the heathens at that time expected the extirpation of Christianity as confidently as the papists do now the extirpation of the northern heresy.

St. Austin allows them the latest time they could suppose for the beginning of Christian religion, viz. the Pentecost that was next after Christ's death. He shews that 365 years, reckoned from that Pentecost, do end in the consulship of Honorius and Eutychianus, which is in our way of reckoning, the year 398. 'Now,' says he, 'the next year to that being the consulship of Honorius and Manlius Theodorus, when, according to that oracle of devils, or figment of men, there should have been no such thing as Christian religion in the world, what was done in other countries I had not occasion to inquire; but this I know, that in Carthage, the most noted and eminent city of all Africa, Gaudentius and Jovius, the emperor Honorius' lieutenants, did, on the 19th of March, pull down the temples of the false gods, and break in pieces their idols. From which time to this present, being almost thirty years, who does not see how much the worship of Christ's name has increased? Especially since many of those are become Christians who were before kept back from the faith by that prophecy, which, now the time is past, they perceive to have been a foolish and idle one.'

Baronius thinks that this order of Honorius, for razing the heathen temples, was given by him in compliance with that petition made by this council of Carthage; and if so, the razing being anno 399, the council must have been the year before. But others think that the style of the petition supposes the temples and such public places of idolatry at Carthage to be destroyed already; and that the bishops desire the emperor to complete that good work, by extirpating all the remains of idolatry practised with images placed in groves, trees, &c.

<sup>1</sup> De Civitate Dei, lib. xviii. cap. 53, 54.



This latter seems the more probable by the words of the petition. So the council may be supposed to be the year after the emperor's first order, viz. *anno Christi* 400; but however it appears to have been about this time.

V. There had been, as it seems in some council at Hippo before  
290. that time, a resolution to the same purpose, viz. that those  
(A. D. 390.) who had no certain proof of their baptism in infancy, should be, for certainty, baptized now. For there is in Labbe's Collection<sup>n</sup>, and in the Magdeburgenses<sup>o</sup> at the year 397, set down a copy of a synodical letter dated *Cesario et Attico Coss.* wherein they complain, 'that those things which had been long ago enacted in 'the council of Hippo had not been so duly put in execution as they 'ought.' They enjoin better execution of them for the future, and to that purpose give a breviate of them, being forty-one in number: the fortieth of which is given thus: 'De his qui in nullo testimonio 'se baptizatos noverunt, ut baptizentur.' 'For those that are not 'sure by any evidence that they have been baptized, that they be 'now baptized.'

VI. It was not long after these times that Leo the first, bishop  
340. of Rome, had occasion to consider of the same case in a  
(A. D. 440.) synod at Rome; and he has left an epistle on that subject: which, though it be something later than the period of time which I have proposed to search, Leo being made bishop of that see in the year of Christ 440, yet it being so particularly relating to this matter, I shall here transcribe so much of it as is to this purpose. It is directed to Neon, bishop of Ravenna, and is the 37th<sup>p</sup> among his epistles.

'We have been given to understand by the relation of some 'brethren, that several captives, who were carried into captivity at 'that age which has no firm knowledge of any thing, do, now they 'are restored to their liberty and their home, desire the remedy of 'baptism. But by reason of the ignorance of their infancy, they 'cannot remember whether or no they have received the sacrament 'of that mystery before. And that by reason of this uncertain state 'of remembrance, their souls are brought into danger; for that 'under pretence of caution the grace is denied them, *Quæ ideo non 'impeditur quia putatur impensa*, being therefore not given them, 'because it is supposed that they have had it already.

<sup>n</sup> [Collect. Reg. Paris. tom. iii. p. 513. Labb. ii. p. 1179. Mansi, iii. p. 893.]

<sup>o</sup> Cent. iv. cap. 9. de Synodis, p. 866.

<sup>p</sup> [Viz. in Labbe and the older collec-

tions: the 135th in Quesnel's edition of Leo's works, 1675; or the 166th in Mansi's edition of the Councils, tom. vi. p. 387.]

‘ When therefore the scrupulousness of some brethren did, not  
‘ without cause, make a doubt of administering to such persons the  
‘ sacrament of our Lord’s mystery ; we did, as I said, at a synodical  
‘ meeting take this sort of case into our consideration, and set our-  
‘ selves to discuss the point with a careful diligence, according to the  
‘ opinion of every one : that by the judgment of many considering  
‘ the matter together, we might more certainly fix on the truth.  
‘ And that which by God’s guidance came into my mind, the  
‘ numerous consent of the brethren confirmed.

‘ We ought then, above all things, to beware, that while we shew  
‘ a sort of caution we do not fall into a failure of regenerating their  
‘ souls. For who would be so addicted to his suspicions, as to define  
‘ a thing to be true, which without any full proof, he by an uncertain  
‘ opinion surmises to be so ? therefore when as neither he that  
‘ desires the regeneration does remember that he was ever baptized,  
‘ nor any one else can testify of his consecration [or, sanctification],  
‘ there is no reason to think there is any sin in doing this, when  
‘ neither he that is consecrated, nor he that consecrates him, acts  
‘ any thing against his knowledge [or, conscience].

‘ I know indeed that it is an inexcusable fault, when, according  
‘ to the fashion of the heretics, which is condemned by the holy  
‘ fathers, any one is compelled to reiterate his baptism, which is once  
‘ for all given to those that are to be regenerated : the apostolic  
‘ doctrine being against such a practice, and teaching us that there  
‘ is but one Godhead in the Trinity, one confession in the faith, and  
‘ one sacrament of baptism. But there is nothing like that to be  
‘ feared in this case ; for that cannot be brought within compass of  
‘ the crime of reiteration, of which we are not sure that it has been  
‘ done once.

‘ And therefore when any such case comes before you, first ex-  
‘ amine the matter narrowly ; and continue your search for a great  
‘ while (unless the party seems to be nigh his end), whether there  
‘ be nobody at all to be found that can help out the ignorance of such  
‘ a person that knows not his own condition. And if it appear, that  
‘ he that wants the sacrament is kept off only by a vain surmise, let  
‘ him come without fear to the obtaining of the grace, of which he  
‘ does not find any evidence that he has had it before. And let us  
‘ not be afraid to open the gate of salvation to him who cannot be  
‘ proved as yet to have entered into it.

‘ But if it can be proved that any such person has been baptized,  
‘ though by the heretics ; let the sacrament of regeneration be by no  
‘ means reiterated on him : but let that only which was wanting

‘ there, be now added ; that he have the imposition of hands by the bishop, for the obtaining the grace of the Holy Spirit.

‘ These things, dear brother, I was willing should come to the knowledge of you all ; lest, while you allow too much to your scruples, the mercy of God be denied to those that desire to be saved.

‘ Dated the ninth before the kalends of November,  
‘ in the consulship of Marcian<sup>9</sup> the emperor.’

The same question being put to him by Rusticus, bishop of Narbon, he resolves it to the same effect<sup>r</sup> ; and so does  
490. (A.D. 590.) Gregory the Great, in the next ages ; and so does the  
591. (A.D. 691.) council in Trullo, Can. 84. anno 691.

The heretics that Leo talks of, as reiterating baptism, were either the Marcionites, who gave to some people a second or third baptism, though they owned the first to have been true baptism ; or else the Donatists, who thinking no baptism to be true that was not given by such holy and pure men as themselves, gave a new baptism to all that came from any other party to theirs.

The church of England is very careful, as not to let any one go without baptism, so also not to baptize again those that have been baptized already. And therefore when any person is brought to baptism, concerning whom they cannot be sure whether he is already baptized or not, they order him to be baptized with these conditional words preceding the form of baptism, ‘ If thou art not already baptized, *N. I baptize thee in the name,*’ &c.

It had been usual to do so for many hundred years before<sup>t</sup>. But  
1059. Luther found great fault with this custom ; and Vossius dis-  
(A.D. 1159.) likes it, but gives no other reason against it than that there is no example of such conditional baptism in scripture, nor in the records of the first ages. Which in a case that so seldom happens, is no wonder ; for in the church of England, where it is appointed in a certain case, yet that case being rare, very few have ever had occasion to practise it. But it is certain that all that do baptize in such a case do understand that condition, though they do not express it ; for they do it on a supposal that the party is not baptized already.

The next council of Carthage that I know of, that had any occasion  
311. to mention infant-baptism, was that anno 411, or the  
(A.D. 411.) beginning of 412, where Cælestius was challenged for denying original sin, and thought to escape the brand of heresy by

<sup>9</sup> [Or *Majorianus* ; see the notes of Quesnel and of Mansi on the place.]

<sup>r</sup> Ep. 92. cap. 16. [Ep. 2. edit. Quesnel : 167. edit. Concil. Mansi.]

<sup>s</sup> Lib. xii. Ep. 31.

<sup>t</sup> Vide Vossium de Baptismo, Disp. 15. Art. 11. et lib. vi. capit. Caroli Magni.

declaring, that whatever he thought of sin in infants, yet he owned their baptism. This council is not in the volumes, but St. Austin has preserved some of the acts of it, by quoting them in his writings<sup>t</sup>; and I had occasion to recite out of him what is material to this purpose in a chapter<sup>u</sup> before.

<sup>316.</sup> And the next to that was that anno 416. A synodical (A.D. 416.) letter whereof I shall recite hereafter<sup>x</sup>.

## CHAP. XVII.

### *Out of the Decretal Epistles of Siricius and Innocentius, Bishops of Rome.*

§ I. THERE never was a greater cheat and abuse put upon the <sup>284.</sup> church and the learned world, than that piece of forgery (A.D. 384.) of the most ancient Decretal Epistles. The papists themselves are now ashamed to hear them mentioned, except some few, whose want of all shame makes amends for their want of learning.

The history of them in short is this: the ancient bishops of Rome were frequently consulted by the country bishops, and the bishops of the neighbouring churches, in cases of conscience, faith, or discipline. They wrote letters in answer to such questions as were put to them. Toward the latter end of the fourth century there began a custom of registering and preserving these letters in the archives of that church. This was in the following times found to be of great use; for these letters served the succeeding bishops for precedents, when their judgment was desired in the like cases.

After many ages, it came into the mind of some of that church, to think how great pity it was that that custom of registering those letters had not begun sooner, for there were none extant in the registers that were earlier than about the time I mentioned.

The way that they took to make up that deficiency was such, as that the mention thereof must make a Christian blush, whenever the credit of his religion is attacked by a heathen. Some among them, that had no regard to true or false, put in practice that foul artifice that is used by faithless and fabulous historians; who, when they would set forth the antiquities of their nation, and find no records nor race of kings so ancient as they could wish, do make out of their own brain histories of times, names of kings, accounts of wars and successions, as far back as they please to feign. Of which we see

<sup>t</sup> [See all which is remaining, in Mansi's edition of the councils, tom. iv. p. 290.]

<sup>u</sup> Ch. v. § 8.

<sup>x</sup> Ch. xix. § 28.



instances in the fabulous histories of the Romans, Britons, Scots, Egyptians, Chinese, &c. This is scandalous and hateful enough in secular histories; but in the concerns of religion, is the highest pitch of impiety and mischief.

Finding that their bishops of the first ages had none of these decretal epistles upon record, as many of the following ones had, they made some for them, and put them out under their names. And as there was a very corrupt state of that church at the time when these acts were forged, the authors of them failed not to make the ancient popes say all that they had a mind they should have said. So that you shall there frequently find some bishop of Rome of the primitive times, who was in reality an humble, poor, and persecuted bishop, strutting and vapouring about the supremacy of his see, and enacting many things that were really never heard in his time.

When any thing is discovered and made plain, we are apt to wonder that it was not discovered sooner. It was a time of great ignorance and barbarity when these forged epistles were put upon the world. And in the beginning of the reformation, the protestants were much puzzled with them. They saw plain enough that the corrupt doctrines and practices then received had no foundation in the scripture, nor in the writings of the ancient Christians for several ages; but they knew not what to say to these epistles, many of which were dated in and nigh the times of the apostles, and yet had in them rank popery. Those first bishops of all, Clement, Anaclet, Evarest, Alexander, Xystus, and the holy martyr Telephorus, &c., did there all speak the language of Gregory the VIIth.

It is true that here and there one of the best learned and most free men among the papists themselves had before that time declared their objections against some of these epistles. For example, cardinal

1334. Cusanus, after he had shewn by plain proofs that the charter (A.D. 1434.) of Constantine's donation was a forgery, adds, 'As perhaps are some other of the large writings attributed to St. Clement and Anaclet. For the letters themselves, examined by the circumstances of the times of those men, do bewray themselves.' But these exceptions of one or two men availed nothing against the general vote; they were universally received, the canonists made constant use of them, and the canon law of that time was in great measure made out of them. Wickliffe ventured to say that they were apocryphal, [or spurious,] and that the clergy were fools to study them. Which

is reckoned for the thirty-eighth of the forty-five heresies, for which he was condemned by the council of Constance.

<sup>1417.</sup> Luther exclaimed against them after his way, and caused (A.D. 1517.) them and the whole body of the decretals to be publicly burnt; but he had not learning enough to trace and descry the forgery of

<sup>1456.</sup> them. But bishop Jewel, being to answer his adversary Harding, who had pressed him with authorities out of them, made (A.D. 1556.) use of his skill in ecclesiastical history to disclose plain proofs of forgery in several of them. And the critics since, both those of the Romish and reformed church, have, by a particular examination, put it out of doubt that all of them, beyond the times I spoke of, are spurious.

They are never mentioned by any writer of any antiquity; they are written, not in the style that was in use in the time of the Roman empire, but in that of the barbarous age. The dates of almost all of them are inconsistent with history. The ignorant forger has made most of them speak of men and things, customs and forms, that were not in being at that time. Beside, that each epistle has in itself some particular proof of its being forged.

II. Now that which the critics and learned men are agreed on is, that the epistles of pope Siricius, who was made bishop anno 384, are the first of all the decretal epistles that are genuine, i. e. that were really written by the men whose names they bear. It is true that there are epistles extant, one of Clement, out of which I gave a quotation, ch. i. § 1, and some of Cornelius, and one or two more, which are undoubted, and are mentioned and valued by all the ancients: but the forger of the decretals took no notice of them; either because they were nothing for his turn, or perhaps he was so ignorant as not to know of them. Those which he has made, are of more use to the design of the court of Rome, but otherwise of no worth.

But indeed the church of Rome affords in all but a very few writers of any antiquity. And if she be the mother, she was in those times outdone by many of her daughters for number of learned men. Since Clement and Hermas, who lived in the apostles' time, and St. Hierome, who had his education in that church, there has been none that I have had occasion to mention in this tract till this Siricius:

III. He has several epistles extant that are genuine, and are mentioned by writers so ancient and so learned as not to be imposed on by the forementioned forgery. And the marks of popish worship, that are so frequent in the elder forged epistles, are all vanished again in those of Siricius and Innocent, and of several popes that

succeeded them. That which I have occasion to quote is the first of them, which is written to Himerius, bishop of Arragon in Spain.

He gives him several directions about ecclesiastical matters, and finds fault with many things that by his information he understood to be managed disorderly in that church. It is divided into fifteen chapters, or paragraphs; whereof the second is this:

*Siricii Episcopi Decretalis Epistola prima. Capitulo secundo<sup>z</sup>.*

‘ Sequitur de diversis baptizandorum temporibus, prout unicuique libitum fuerit, improbabilis et emendanda confusio; quæ a nostris consacerdotibus (quod commoti dicimus) non ratione auctoritatis alicujus, sed sola temeritate præsumitur: ut passim ac libere natalitiis Christi, seu apparitionis nec non et apostolorum seu martyrum festivitatis, innumeræ (ut asseris) plebes baptismi mysterium consequantur. Cum hoc sibi privilegium et apud nos et apud omnes ecclesias dominicum specialiter cum Pentecoste sua pascha defendat: quibus solis per annum diebus ad fidem confluentibus generalia baptismatis tradi convenit sacramenta. His duntaxat electis, qui ante quadraginta vel eo amplius dies nomen dederint, et exorcismis quotidianisque orationibus atque jejuniis fuerint expiati, quatenus apostolica illa impleatur præceptio, *ut expurgato fermento veteri nova incipiat esse conspersio.*

‘ Sicut sacram ergo Paschalem reverentiam in nullo dicimus esse minuendam, ita infantibus qui necdum loqui poterunt per ætatem, vel his quibus in qualibet necessitate opus fuerit sacri unda baptismatis, omni volumus celeritate succurri: ne ad nostrarum perniciem tendat animarum si negato desiderantibus fonte salutari, exiens unusquisque de seculo et regnum perdat et vitam.

‘ Quicumque etiam discrimen naufragii, hostilitatis incursum, obsidionis ambiguum, vel cujuslibet corporalis ægritudinis desperationem inciderint, et sibi unico credulitatis auxilio poposcerint subveniri, eodem quo poseunt momento temporis expetitæ regenerationis præmia consequantur.’

‘ There is also a blamable disorder which ought to be amended, in baptizing at various times as every one fancies; which our fellow bishops among you do venture to practise, as I am somewhat vexed to hear, not by the rule of any authority, but by mere rashness. So that great numbers of people do, as you say, receive their baptism, some at Christmas, some at the Epiphany, and some on the holy days of the apostles and martyrs. Whereas not only in our church, but in all churches, our Lord’s passover, [viz. Easter,] together with its Pentecost, does peculiarly challenge this

<sup>z</sup> [Apud Labbei Concilia, tom. ii. p. 1017.—edit. Mansi, tom. iii. p. 656.]



‘ privilege to itself. On which days of the year alone, it is fitting  
 ‘ that the common sacraments of baptism should be given to those  
 ‘ that come to the faith. And that those only should be admitted  
 ‘ who had given in their names forty days or more before, and have  
 ‘ been cleansed by exorcisms, [or renunciations of the devil and  
 ‘ wickedness,] and daily prayers and fastings, to the end that that  
 ‘ precept of the apostle may be fulfilled, of *purging out the old leaven,*  
 ‘ *that there may be a new lump.*

‘ As therefore I affirm that the respect due to the feast of Easter  
 ‘ ought by no means to be diminished; so my meaning is, that as  
 ‘ for infants, who by reason of their age, are not yet able to speak,  
 ‘ and others that are in any case of necessity, they ought to be  
 ‘ relieved with all speed possible; lest it turn to the perdition of  
 ‘ our own souls, if we deny the water of salvation to any one that  
 ‘ stands in need, and they departing this life, do lose their kingdom  
 ‘ and their life.

‘ Whoever also shall be in danger of shipwreck, or of the assaults  
 ‘ of enemies, or of a siege, or shall be likely to die of any bodily  
 ‘ sickness, and shall desire to be assisted with that which is the only  
 ‘ armour of our faith, [or religion,] that they have the gift of  
 ‘ regeneration which they desire, the same moment that they  
 ‘ desire it.’

I have set down this the more at large, because we see by it, that  
 at the same time when they insist upon those preparations, and personal  
 qualifications of the adult, they do except the case of infants.  
 It is common for some antipædobaptist writers to quote such pas-  
 sages as the forepart of this, taken by itself, would be, as testimonies  
 that such authors allowed no baptism of infants, because they  
 require those preparatory exercises of all that are to be baptized.  
 This I have seen done a hundred times, when the same author that  
 is quoted does sometimes in the same treatise, (as here,) and some-  
 times in other parts of his works, shew that infants are to be bap-  
 tized, as being in a case that is exempt from the general rule that  
 requires faith, prayer, repentance, and other personal preparation.  
 It is no wonder that they do thus with other books, when they  
 can hardly forbear doing it with the Catechism of the church of  
 England, which requires repentance and faith of persons to be bap-  
 tized; but shews by the next words, that the case of infants is an  
 exempt case. This practice, though not always so palpable, yet is in  
 effect always as unfair, as that with which Wills charges Danvers,  
 viz. for quoting the canon of a certain council, as enacting, that  
 ‘ none should receive baptism, without rehearsing the Creed, or



‘Lord’s Prayer,’ and stopping there; when the next words are ‘Except those, who by reason of age, cannot yet speak<sup>a</sup>.’

That which Siricius here says, that it was the custom of the church of Rome, and of all other churches, to give baptism only at Easter and Whitsuntide, excepting infants, sick people, and other such extraordinary cases, may be proved from a great many other authors. I shall mention no more but Tertullian, for his antiquity. He says, ‘The most solemn time for baptism is Easter, at which time the passion of our Lord, into which we are baptized, was performed: —After that, the Pentecost affords a large time for ordering the lavers.—But yet every day is the Lord’s. Any hour, any time whatever is capable to be made use of for baptism. Though there be some difference as to the solemnity, there is none as to the grace given<sup>b</sup>.’

IV. I said that this epistle appears to be genuine, and not forged, among the others of the foregoing popes, by the mention that is made of it, by authors so ancient and so learned, as not to be imposed on by that forgery. This very passage of it is quoted by Hinemarus Rhemensis<sup>c</sup> anno 835, and by the council of Tribur<sup>d</sup>, anno 895. And, I suppose, other parts of it may have been quoted by

735.  
(A. D. 835.) earlier writers, which I have not had occasion to observe. The pretended Isidore, out of whose shop the forged collection of epistles is supposed first to have come, lived about these times, and seems to have been contemporary with Hinemarus, but something the elder: but as all forged works do require some time after their first hatching, to be known, or at least to gain any authority: there is no likelihood that so learned men (as Hinemarus especially was) should quote any thing upon a dependance on so fresh an imposture. Especially when neither he nor the council do quote it as from Isidore, but as an epistle generally known in the world. And besides, the learned critics, Quesnellus, Du Pin, &c., that do question one of Siricius’ epistles, as being to be suspected of forgery for reasons they give, do make no question of this.

By the said quotations of Hinemarus and Concilium Triburiense, 795.  
(A. D. 895.) it also appears, that the custom of limiting the baptism of adult persons to Easter, and the times aforesaid, continued

<sup>a</sup> Appeal to Baptists against H. D. ch. i. [at p. 161 of ‘Vindiciæ Vindiciarum, or a vindication of a late treatise entitled, “Infant Baptism asserted,” in answer to ‘Mr. Danvers’ Reply: also an appeal to the Baptists (so called) against Mr. Danvers,’ &c. by Obed. Wills, M. A. 12mo. London, 1675.]

<sup>b</sup> De Baptismo, cap. 19.

<sup>c</sup> Opusculo 55. Capitulum, cap. 31. [Opuscula et Epistolæ Hincmari Remensis Archiepiscopi, 4<sup>o</sup>. Lutetiae, 1615, reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, 1618. tom. ix. and in the Nova Bibliotheca, sive Supplementum, fol. 1639. tom. ii.]

<sup>d</sup> Can. 12.

in the church till their time : and it did continue something longer. But of later times we hear no more of it. I suppose because the baptisms of adult persons grew to be very few ; the heathen nations being now become Christian ; and hardly any but infants being baptized, which were not contained in that rule. For it was but about 300 years after this time 890, that Petrus Cluniacensis writing

1030. against some that at that time, anno Dom. 1130, set up a (A.D. 1130.) doctrine that baptism given to an infant is no baptism, opposed to them this among other things ; that ‘ if it were so, then, ‘ whereas all Europe has had never a person now for 300, or hardly ‘ any for 500 years, baptized otherwise than in infancy, it has had ‘ never a Christian in it.’ The place I quote more largely hereafter<sup>c</sup>.

V. This order of the ancient church, that no adult person, except in case of necessity, should be baptized but at these set and appointed times, was made for a very good and weighty reason, viz. because there was not so much care likely to be taken of his instruction and examination if he were baptized at some other time of the year alone by himself, as there was if he were baptized at Easter, when the other catechumeni were baptized. Because for some weeks before Easter, the ministers of the church made it their business to catechise, examine, and prepare the candidates for baptism. They were to give in their names forty days before ; and they were to be able to repeat the Creed, &c., and to give account of their faith twenty days before, (something more or less, according to the canons of the several churches,) and the people came together to hear these examinations and professions ; and care was taken that they did spend the time in prayers, fastings, and such other holy exercises as would fit them for so great a change of their state. And, because there were at Easter a great number of them, and the spiritual good of the church did in great measure depend upon their doing well ; it was counted an occasion weighty enough to require that the whole church should at that time pray and fast with them and for them, as I quoted out of Justin Martyr. ‘ They are directed to pray, ‘ and ask of God with fasting, the forgiveness of their former sins, ‘ and we also pray and fast together with them<sup>f</sup>.’

And this, I believe, was none of the least occasions of keeping the fast of Lent before Easter.

And we see also to this day some remains of the catechising used then ; for though the church of England do now appoint catechising

<sup>c</sup> Part ii. ch. vii. § 5.

<sup>f</sup> Chap. ii. § 2.

all the year long, yet most of the curates therein omit it all the year, except the time of Lent; but at that time that office is by old custom kept on foot. It was to prepare the candidates for baptism at Easter, that the Lent catechising was used.

Also in the Liturgy of the same church, and in that of the church of Rome, the collect for the third Sunday after Easter remains in that form which seems to have been composed at first with a particular respect to the new baptized persons. ‘Almighty God, who shewest to them that be in error the light of thy truth, to the intent that they may return into the way of righteousness; grant unto all them that are admitted into the fellowship of Christ’s religion, that they may eschew those things that are contrary to their profession, and follow all such things as are agreeable to the same, through our Lord Jesus Christ.’ This is a good prayer at all times, and for all persons; but I believe the first composing it for that Sunday was in regard to the neophytes. The collects for Easter, and the two Sundays following, referring to the resurrection, the next was for them.

VI. The ninth chapter or canon of the same epistle of Siricius, is, to blame the people of Spain for choosing into the ministry some such as had been but lately converted to the Christian religion; and he gives them this direction:

‘Quicumque igitur se ecclesiæ vovit [l. vovet] obsequiis, a sua infantia ante pubertatis annos baptizari et lectorum debet ministerio sociari.’

‘He that devotes himself to the service of the church ought to be baptized [i. e. ought to be one that was baptized] in his infancy, before ripeness of age, and employed in the office of the readers.’

This rule was a little after repeated to the people of Spain, by Innocentius, in words just to the same purpose, only a little plainer, which I shall recite presently.

VII. After Siricius, Anastasius sat but about three or four years, <sup>300.</sup> and was succeeded by Innocentius the first. He must (A. D. 400.) have been a man of note in the church before the year 400, for it was in the year 402 that he was made bishop of Rome. He also has some decretal epistles (besides those to the council of Carthage, which I shall cite hereafter) that mention infant-baptism, and are by all acknowledged to be genuine.

His first is written to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, giving him his resolution in several things wherein he had demanded it; whereof the third is, that though the presbyters might baptize infants, yet only bishops might give them the chrism, or anointing

on the forehead, which was in those times given after baptism : it is as follows :

*Epistolæ Decretalis Innocentii ad Decentium, Canon 3.*<sup>g</sup>

‘ De consignandis vero infantibus, manifestum est non ab alio  
‘ quam ab episcopo fieri licere. Nam presbyteri, licet sint sacerdotes,  
‘ pontificatus tamen apicem non habent. Hæc autem pontificibus  
‘ solis deberi, ut vel consignent, vel Paracletum Spiritum tradant,  
‘ non solum consuetudo ecclesiastica demonstrat, verum et illa lectio  
‘ Actuum Apostolorum quæ asserit Petrum et Joannem esse directos,  
‘ qui jam baptizatis traderent Spiritum Sanctum. Nam presbyteris,  
‘ seu extra episcopum, seu præsentem episcopum cum baptizant, chris-  
‘ mate baptizatos ungere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit conse-  
‘ cratum ; non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo signare, quod solis  
‘ debetur episcopis,’ &c.

‘ As for the anointing of infants on the forehead with the chrism,  
‘ it is plain that that ought to be done by none but the bishop.  
‘ For presbyters, though they be as priests, yet they have not the  
‘ preeminence of the chief priests. And that it is lawful for the chief  
‘ priests only, either to anoint on the forehead, or give the Holy  
‘ Spirit, appears not only by the custom of the church, but also by  
‘ that place in the Acts of the Apostles, which tells us<sup>h</sup>, that Peter  
‘ and John were sent to give the Holy Spirit to such as were already  
‘ baptized. For when presbyters do give baptism, either in the  
‘ presence of the bishop or out of his presence, they may anoint the  
‘ baptized person with chrism, provided it be such as has been con-  
‘ secrated by the bishop ; but they must not anoint the forehead  
‘ with the same ; for that is peculiar to the bishops,’ &c.

Though this place do not mention the baptism of these infants, yet it plainly supposes it. The chrism was never given to any till they were baptized.

The rule that he sets here, that none but the bishop must give the chrism on the forehead, was the ordinary and general rule of that church ; but yet dispensed with in the case of want of bishops, or their default of doing their office, as I shew hereafter<sup>i</sup>.

VIII. The other passage of Innocentius, which is to the same effect with that which I recited from Siricius, is in his twenty-fourth epistle, which was written to a synod then met at Toledo ; whereof the fifth chapter is a rule given for the qualifications of such as were to be admitted to the ministry. He had determined in the foregoing canons, that no lawyer, soldier, or officer of the temporal court,

<sup>g</sup> [Apud Concilia, edit. Labb. tom. ii. p. 1246.—edit. Mansi, tom. iii. p. 1029.]

<sup>h</sup> Acts viii. 14.

<sup>i</sup> Part ii. ch. ix. § 8.



should be received to holy orders; and then gives the qualifications following.

*Epistola Innocentii primi ad Synodum Toletanam, Can. quintus<sup>k</sup>.*

‘Quales vero eligendi sunt in ordine clericorum, evidens forma declarat, i. e. qui ab ineunte ætate baptizati fuerint, et lectorum officio sociati, vel si majores sunt, cum fuerint Dei gratiam consecuti, statim se ecclesiasticis ordinibus mancipaverint.’

‘And as to the qualifications of such as are to be chosen into the ministry, there is a certain rule, viz. that they be such as have been baptized from their infancy, and have been educated in the office of readers: or, if they were older before they obtained the grace of God, then that they be such as did presently upon it addict themselves to offices of the church.’

It has been often enough said already, that there were in those times, besides those that were baptized in infancy, several that turned from heathenism to Christianity at their ripe age. Such the canon would not have to be put into holy orders; but only such as were baptized in infancy: unless those so converted have, from their first coming to the faith, addicted themselves to the service of the church, in the lower offices: to prevent the inconvenience mentioned by St. Paul, in preferring novices<sup>l</sup>, or neophytes, i. e. persons but lately baptized or made Christians.

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Out of Paulinus bishop of Nola, and another Paulinus,  
deacon of the church of Milan.*

§ I. PAULINUS, bishop of Nola, had been a heathen man: during which time he had addicted his mind to poetry and oratory. After he became a Christian, he made use of those faculties on religious subjects<sup>m</sup>. And Sulpitius Severus, who had built a church, desired him to compose some proper godly sentences to be written in several places of the church, and particularly at the font, or place of baptizing. Paulinus sends him a letter in answer, containing several such sentences: it is,

Epist. 32. *Quæ est duodecima ex iis quæ sunt ad Severum.*

And in one of them, composed in verse for the font, there is this distich:

<sup>k</sup> [Apud Concilia, edit. Labb. tom. ii. p. 1278.—edit. Mansi, iii. p. 1065.]  
<sup>l</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 6.

<sup>m</sup> [The works of Paulinus were publish-

ed separately, in 1622, 1662, and 1688, &c., and are reprinted in the ‘Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima,’ edit. Lugdun. 1677. tom. vi.]

‘ Inde parens sacro ducit de fonte sacerdos

‘ Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu.<sup>n</sup>

‘ The priest from the holy font does infants bring,

‘ In body, in soul, in garments white and clean.’

As he refers to the cleanness of the body, by washing in the font, and of the soul, on account of the forgiveness of sins granted in that holy sacrament; so what he speaks of the whiteness of their garments, is according to the custom then used all over the church, of clothing the new baptized persons, whether infants or grown people, in albes, or white garments.

II. If there were not testimonies enough of the custom of baptizing infants in this age, this alone would not be sufficient to prove it. For there being nothing but the word *infants* singly mentioned, without any other circumstances setting forth their age; and there being a custom about these times of calling, by a metaphorical speech, all the new baptized persons, infants, whether they were young or old; it is a question whether Paulinus did by that word intend to restrain the sense to infants in age, or whether he meant only to describe the procession of the priest leading from the font a number of new baptized persons in general, in their albes.

That there was such a custom of calling new baptized persons by the name of *infants*, about this time, appears by several instances. Gaudentius, who was bishop of Brescia about this time, has an oration, or sermon, in which he thus bespeaks the novices, or new baptized persons: ‘ You are put in mind by the name of infants, by which you are called, that you are by your baptism regenerated and born anew; and therefore if any of you that are married<sup>o</sup>,’ &c. Also St. Austin<sup>p</sup> has a sermon or discourse entitled, *Ad infantes*, ‘ to the infants,’ i. e. to a congregation of persons then newly baptized. And I confess it seems to me that that passage of St. Ambrose<sup>q</sup>, *De mysterio Paschæ*, c. 5, which Mr. Bingham, vol. iv. p. 24<sup>r</sup>, takes to be spoken of proper infants, is rather to be referred hither. He is there speaking of the holy Christian rites used at the feast of Easter, particularly the baptismal solemnities; and says, ‘ Hinc vitalis lavaeri

<sup>n</sup> [Bibl. Patr. tom. vi. p. 192.]

<sup>o</sup> Orat. 8. ad Neophytos, [de Lectione Evangelii; apud Bibl. Patr. tom. v. p. 954. edit. Lugd.]

<sup>p</sup> [Not only one, but five sermons of this father, preached on Easter-day, occur in his works, addressed either ‘ad infantes,’ or ‘ad populum et ad infantes, seu eo die baptizatos:’ viz. sermons 124 to 128; vol. v. p. 968, &c. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>q</sup> [This treatise, under the title of ‘Sermo xxxv. de Mysterio Paschæ II.’ is placed among the pieces falsely attributed to St. Ambrose, in the Appendix to the Benedictine edition of his works, p. 438.]

<sup>r</sup> [Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, or *Antiquities of the Christian Church*: 8vo. 1708, &c. fol. 1726. 8vo. 1821–7. The passage referred to occurs in book xi. ch. 4. sect. 14.]

‘sacræ ecclesiæ editi puerperio infantes, parvulorum simplicitate renati, balatu innocentis perstrepunt conscientiæ. Hinc casti patres, pudicæ etiam matres, novellam per fidem stirpem prosequuntur innumeram.’ ‘Here the infants brought forth of the womb of the vital laver of the holy church, being regenerated in the simplicity of babes, do sing from the bottom of a sinless conscience. Here chaste fathers and mothers do follow great numbers of their children new born by faith.’ He means, I think, the godfathers following the new baptized persons, whom they had brought to baptism; and who walked from the font in procession in their albes.

This does not at all invalidate the testimonies which have been given for infant-baptism. For in all that I have quoted, except this and one or two more, there is, beside the word *infant*, some circumstance that does shew the speech to be about infants in age. It rather confirms the thing, and is itself a testimony: for one reason of the name was, that the number of Christians being now much increased, and the baptism of Christian infants being more frequent than of elder persons new converted, these latter had the name of infants in allusion to the former.

III. *Paulinus de obitu Celsi pueri.* On the death of Celsus a child.

This Celsus was a child very dear to his parents, that died at seven years old, or when he was newly entered into his eighth, as appears by some passages of the discourse.

His parents were so overmuch concerned at his death, that Paulinus found it necessary to write to them a consolatory advice. It is written in verse, and after the first distich follow these two:

‘Quem Dominus tanto cumulavit munere Christus,

‘Ut rudis ille annis, et novus iret aquis:

Atque bis infantem, spatio ævi, et fonte lavacri,

‘Congeminata Deo gratia perveheret.’

‘So great a favour Christ did to him show,

‘That he escaping all the snares below,

‘Should hence so young, and fresh from baptism go: }

‘Two graces do his infant soul commend,

‘So little sullied, and so lately clean’d.’

This quotation is not fully to the purpose either of the pædobaptists or antipædobaptists: for the one will inquire why this child’s baptism was delayed so long as till he was almost seven years old; and the other, why he was baptized so soon. And there is not any

such account of the condition of his parents as to satisfy either of them. They might perhaps be, as Paulinus himself was, lately converted; or it might be deferred by negligence and procrastination. St. Austin somewhere, but I have forgot where, speaks of fourteen years as the soonest that people were ordinarily baptized on their own profession: yet at another place, where his adversary would prove that unbaptized children might go to heaven, by the instance of Dinocrates, a boy born of heathen parents, and dying at seven years old, whose soul was said in a certain story-book to have been seen in heaven in a vision by his sister in her prayers; he says, 'It is not impossible but that at that age he might have been baptized at his own choice,' which place I have occasion to recite hereafter<sup>t</sup>.

It is plain enough by what has been said, that the ordinary time of baptizing infants was within a little time after their birth. And the antipædobaptists, I suppose, do not think a child of seven years old any fitter than a mere infant.

The custom that I mentioned, of calling new baptized persons by the name of infants, is alluded to here: for Paulinus calls this child, *bis infantem*, in two respects an infant, viz. *spatio ævi et fonte lavaeri*, an infant in age, and an infant, as newly baptized.

Paulinus has some letters and tracts attributed to him that are <sup>395.</sup> spurious: but this is recited among his works, by Gen- (A.D. 495.) nadius, in these words: 'Paulinus bishop of Nola in Campania wrote many things in way of short poems; and a consolatory tract to Celsus, in form of an epitaph, on the death of his Christian and baptized infant, full of Christian hope<sup>u</sup>,' &c.

*Paulini Epistola ad Hieronymum de duabus Questionibus,*  
*apud Hieronym. Ep. 153<sup>x</sup>.*

IV. Paulinus in this letter desired St. Hierome's opinion of the meaning of two sayings which the Scripture uses.

One was, what is said, Exod. ix. 12. He asks 'Why [or in what sense] Pharaoh's heart was hardened by God?' And also, how that which the apostle says, is to be understood, *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy*<sup>y</sup>; which seems to take away freewill.

The other was concerning that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14. *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*. On which Paulinus asks this question:

<sup>t</sup> Ch. xx. § 3.

<sup>u</sup> Catalog. Virorum illustrium. [cap. 48. p. 165, edit. Colon. 1580.]

<sup>x</sup> [In edit. Vallarsii, ep. 85. Op. tom. i.

p. 529.]

<sup>y</sup> Rom. ix. 16.



‘ Quomodo sancti sint qui de fidelibus, id est, de baptizatis nascuntur; cum sine dono gratiæ postea acceptæ et custoditæ salvi esse non possint?’

‘ How those children that are born of *fidel*, that is, of baptized parents, are holy; whereas, without the gift of the grace [of baptism], afterward [viz. after their birth] received and preserved, they cannot be saved?’

He seems at this place to have taken the obvious sense of St. Paul’s words to be, that the infants of Christian parents are holy from their birth; and desires to know what holiness this is that St. Paul ascribes to them from their birth; since though the parents be baptized Christians, yet unless the children also be themselves baptized, they cannot be saved.

This is the most material of the evidences we have from him on this subject: for if it be concluded, as he does here conclude, that infants cannot be saved without baptism; it will undoubtedly follow in any one’s sense, that they ought to be baptized without delay.

V. This letter of Paulinus is not extant, that I know of, and perhaps was never published. But St. Hierome, in his answer to it, which is his Epist. 153. [85.] *ad Paulinum*, recites out of it what I have here set down.

He makes his answer very short, and that for two reasons which he gives: One was, that by every ship that sailed for the west, he had so many letters of this nature to send, that he could not bestow pains on any one, but was forced to write whatever came extempore into his mind. The other was, that to so great a critic as Paulinus, he did not dare write a long letter, in which the more faults would be found.

It shews us by the way, how diligent people were at that time in seeking to have the true sense of scripture; and of how great repute St. Hierome’s learning was; when Paulinus, and so many others, sent letters a thousand miles to him to desire his opinion.

St. Hierome refers him, for an answer to his first question, to Origen’s book *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, which he had then newly translated into Latin, and whereof he might have a copy in Pammachius’ hands, to whom he had dedicated and sent it. And for the second, his answer is this:

‘ Of your second question Tertullian has discoursed in his books *de Monogamia*, [leg. *de Anima*,] holding that the children of Christians are styled holy, as being candidates [or, expectants] of the faith, and not polluted with any idolatrous filth or trumpery.

‘ Also you may mind that we read of the vessels of the tabernacle

‘being called holy, and many other utensils of the ceremonies; whereas nothing can be properly holy, but what has sense, and fears God. It is therefore a phrase of scripture sometimes to call those holy that are clean and purified, or expiated from uncleanness, as Bathsheba is said to be sanctified [or, made holy] from her uncleanness.

‘I entreat you not to impute to me either trifling, or wrong interpretation: for God is witness to my conscience, that the hurry I have mentioned to you has hindered me from so much as setting on or attempting the interpretation of the place. And you know nothing is done to any purpose in a hurry.’

St. Hierome had some reason to make an apology for so slight and perfunctory an explication. Yet as it is, it shews that he, as well as Paulinus, thought that such children could not be called holy in any such sense as should entitle them to salvation, unless they were baptized. If he had thought they could, the ready way to take off Paulinus’ doubt had been to answer so: the doubt being this; how they are holy from their birth, since without baptism they cannot be saved? But he answers,

1. By referring him to Tertullian’s account of this place in his book *de Anima*, which I recited before<sup>z</sup>, where he paraphrases the text in this sense, ‘They are holy, that is, they are designed for holiness; for as for any other meaning, our Lord has determined, that without baptism none shall enter into the kingdom of God<sup>a</sup>, which is as much as to say, none shall be holy.’

2. By giving some instances where the word *holy* is applied to some things that are not capable of salvation, or of moral good or evil.

Calvin, and many that have followed him, have boldly ventured on that explication which Paulinus durst not embrace, nor St. Hierome advise, and which Tertullian disapproves. They have determined, that a believer’s child is holy, i. e. is born to salvation, (or as a certain late commentator<sup>b</sup>, supposed to be Mr. Locke, has absurdly paraphrased that place, ‘born a member of the Christian church,’) whether it be baptized or not: that baptism is to be given it indeed, but only as a seal of that holiness which it has by covenant before it be baptized. And to this purpose they expound that text, John iii. 5, of any thing rather than of baptism. And many of them

<sup>z</sup> Ch. iv. § 6.

<sup>a</sup> John iii. 5.

<sup>b</sup> [In ‘A paraphrase and notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Co-

rinthians, Romans, and Ephesians, with an essay for the understanding of St. Paul’s Epistles,’ &c.—London, 1705, 1707, 1709, 1742, &c.]

have determined that the authority of baptizing infants is grounded only on that birth-privilege which they have before; and that no other infants than such as are so holy by their birth, may, or ought to be baptized. Which doctrine involves the baptizer in endless scruples, which infants he may baptize, and which not: as bishop Stillingfleet has largely shewn in the book to which I referred before<sup>c</sup>.

He that has read the foregoing chapters is by this time satisfied, that all the ancients understood our Saviour's words, John iii. 5, of baptism: or will be, by what I shall produce<sup>d</sup>. And that they never refused to baptize a child on account of the parents' wickedness, or even heathenism or infidelity, if the child were offered to baptism by such as were the then owners of the child<sup>e</sup>.

Much less do the explications given by the ancients, of the holiness here spoken of, fit or square to that jejune one given by some antipædobaptists, that St. Paul should mean no more but that the children of believers, though one of the parents do continue in unbelief, are legitimate, and not bastards; which looks as made merely to serve a turn.

On the contrary, the general vein of ancient interpretation is, to understand by this holiness, baptismal holiness, either as given, or designed to be given: as has appeared partly by this quotation, and by some others given before<sup>f</sup>, and will more fully hereafter, where I mean to confer together all the ancient expositions of this text that I know of<sup>g</sup>.

*Paulinus in vita Ambrosii.* [§ 48. edit. Benedict.

Append. tom. ii. p. xiii.]

VI. The other Paulinus was a deacon of the church of Milan, <sup>297.</sup> that ministered to St. Ambrose in his lifetime<sup>h</sup>, and after (A. D. 397.) he was dead wrote the history of his life, which is commonly printed with his works. Erasmus takes this piece for a forgery<sup>i</sup> of later years, because many of the passages he relates look so like the fabulous stories of the monks: and I am almost of his opinion, partly for his reason, and partly for another which I mention hereafter<sup>k</sup>. It must either be so, or else this Paulinus must have been a very vain and credulous man. Neither would I set down the passage here following, which seems as fabulous and idle as any of them, were it not that most of the critics and learned men have

<sup>c</sup> Ch. xi. § 11.

<sup>d</sup> See part ii. ch. vi. § 1.

<sup>e</sup> See part ii. ch. vi. § 10.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. iv. § 12. Ch. xi. § 11. Ch. xii. § 2.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. xix. § 19.

<sup>h</sup> [The Benedictine editors observe, that in many manuscripts he is styled St. Ambrosii *notarius*.]

<sup>i</sup> *Censura operibus Ambrosii præfixa.*

<sup>k</sup> Part ii. ch. iii. § 9.

an opinion of the authenticalness of the tract, and do commonly quote it.

He relates a great many different occasions, on which St. Ambrose's ghost or shape appeared to several persons, after he was dead: and, among the rest, how he having departed this life on

297. Easter eve, his body was carried and laid in the great (A. D. 397.) church.

‘Ibique eadem fuit nocte qua vigilavimus in pascha. Quem plurimi infantes baptizati, quum a fonte venirent, viderunt: ita ut aliqui sedentem in cathedra tribunali dicerent; alii vero ambulantem suis parentibus digito ostenderent. Sed illi videntes videre non poterant, quia mundatos oculos non habebant.’

‘And there it was that night which we spend in watching at Easter [this was the night before Easter-day, on which in the primitive times the whole body of the people did always sit up all night in the church at their prayers]. And a great many of the infants that were then baptized saw him as they came back from the font: some of them saying, there he sits in the bishop's chair: others of them shewed him to their parents, pointing with their hands, that he was going there up the steps [walking]: but the parents looking could not see him, because they had not their eyes cleansed [or enlightened].’

There you have the story, such as it is; grounded probably on the superstitious conceits of women and boys: but yet it shews that there were children among those that were baptized on that day. He calls them infants, but some of them could not be absolute infants, for he mentions their speaking: they seem to have been little boys carried in their parents' arms, or lead in their hands.

These infants, according to this story, being by their baptism just then received, clear from all sin, had their eyes enlightened to see this miracle: but their parents, having been since their baptism stained with many sins, were not capable of it. They called baptism, both in the scripture-times, as appears from Heb. vi. 4, and also in these times, φωτισμός, the illumination, or enlightening of a person.

---

## CHAP. XIX.

*Out of St. Hierome and St. Austin, after the rise of the Pelagian Controversy; as also out of Pelagius, Celestius, Innocent the First, Zosimus, Julianus, Theodorus Mopsuestensis, &c. And out of the Councils of Carthage, Diospolis, Milevis, &c.*

§ I. A NEW heresy, happening in the church at this time, gave



310. more occasion to speak of infant-baptism than ever had (A.D. 410.) been before. Not that any of the parties disapproved it; but one of them held that there is no original sin in infants, and that brought in much discourse about their baptism.

Pelagius, a monk, living at Rome, was the author of this heresy; at least, the first promoter of it in the west. And one Cælestius another monk, was his chief abetter; and afterward, Julianus a bishop, and Anianus a deacon. It was not started till the year of Christ 410. But most of the managers on each side were men of note before the year 400.

The men that I named were the only writers of the Pelagian side: but a considerable number of the people was brought over to incline to their opinions. They argued, that the doctrine of original sin and natural corruption, by which persons are supposed to be born under a necessity of sinning, did cast a reflection on the honour and justice of God, who gives us our being: and this argument was plausible among the vulgar.

Consequently to this, they said that baptism of infants was not for any sin they had, but to gain them admittance into the kingdom of heaven. For they said that children, though they were not baptized, should have an eternal and happy life; not in the kingdom of heaven indeed, because our Saviour, John iii. 5, had determined the contrary: but somewhere, they knew not where.

This, with the rest of their opinions, is briefly set forth by St. Austin, lib. *de Hæresibus*, cap. 88, [Op. tom. viii. p. 25.]

II. For better apprehending the sense of the quotations which we shall produce, a short history of the steps and progress of this sect would be useful: which is also the more necessary, because a late author has wrote the history of it very partially for those heretics. Pretending to give<sup>1</sup> an abstract of what bishop Ussher<sup>m</sup> had collected of this history, he has picked out of it for the most part only such circumstances and such sayings of Pelagius, as taken by themselves, sound most favourably for him; and such of St. Austin and St. Hierome as are most liable to exception.

It is great pity that among all the learned and true histories of Pelagianism, only that should have the luck to be translated into English. But the world knows now by whose means that, and the Lives of some Fathers<sup>n</sup>, written by the same author, and in the

<sup>1</sup> M. Le Clerc, in Bibliothèque Universelle, tom. viii. p. 174-137. 12°. Amst. 1688.

<sup>m</sup> Britannicæ Ecclesiæ Antiquitates; quibus inserta est pestiferæ adversus Dei

gratiam a Pelagio Britanno inductæ hæreseos Historia. [First printed at Dublin, 4°. 1639; and, enlarged and corrected by the author, fol. London, 1687.]

<sup>n</sup> [The work alluded to in the text is,

same vein, have been tacked together, and put into the hands of our vulgar readers.

It seems that, though it be a great fault to write the lives of the catholic Fathers encomiastically, yet it is none to write the lives of the old heretics so. And one that in reading the books of the ancient Christians, passes by the best, and picks out for a specimen of their works, what may be censured in them, is a good author; though he that passes by their *uævi*, and takes most notice of what is most material, does so great a mischief. Or else it is, that the booksellers of Amsterdam will give more money for the copy of a book of the first than of the latter sort, not regarding which does most good or hurt to the cause of Christianity; but which men will have the most curiosity to see and to buy. As it is said of Bleau, that he procured a Socinian book which he had printed, to be burnt by the hangman, that the edition might sell the better.<sup>p</sup>

This author notes<sup>q</sup>, that we have no account of Cælestius' doctrine but from his adversaries: though St. Austin quotes largely the acts of the council where he spoke, and his own books. And, that possibly the sayings objected to him in the council were but consequences drawn from what he had said: though his book and the chapters of it be quoted in the council. And concludes that St. Austin and Pelagius did not understand one another's terms and meaning: and that in many parts of this dispute, they were like two men of different languages, that should scold as loud as they could, without understanding what each other said: and reciting the emperor's edict against the Pelagians, says, 'suspicious persons will think this edict, expressed in so pathetic terms, comes from the pen of some ecclesiastical zealot.' One may know whom he means.

<sup>p</sup> 'The lives of Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Prudentius; containing an impartial account of their lives and writings, together with several curious observations upon both. Also, a short history of Pelagianism. Written originally in French by M. Le Clerc, and now translated into English.' London, 1696. 8°.—In the advertisement the translator repeats Le Clerc's complaint, that hitherto *panegyrics* alone had been written on the Fathers, and that *impartial accounts* of them and their doctrines were still wanting and very necessary: he adds, 'it was also thought fit to print the *history of Pelagianism*, though very short, together with these lives: because several gentlemen may be desirous to have in their own tongue an impartial account of that controversy

'which formerly made so great a noise in the Christian world.'

The originals, from which this version is made, occur in Le Clerc's 'Bibliothèque Universelle,' tom. x. &c. in the shape of dissertations and reviews of editions of the works of those Fathers.]

<sup>o</sup> [These observations are levelled against M. Le Clerc's assertions, in the preface to his life of Clemens Alexandrinus.]

<sup>p</sup> See 'La Religion des Hollandois, [représentée en plusieurs lettres écrites par un Officier de l'armée du Roy, à un pasteur et professeur de théologie de Berne.] 16°. A Cologne, 1673, p. 83.

William Bleau was a celebrated and excellent printer, established at Amsterdam.]

<sup>q</sup> P. 182. ed. 1688.

And endeavouring to shew that St. Austin and St. Hierome, the chief opposers of the Pelagian doctrine, do contradict one another about a main point of it, viz. the possibility of keeping the commandments; he, by a gross mistake, quotes<sup>r</sup> Pelagius' words against Hierome, as if they were St. Austin's, (as I shall by and by shew, having occasion to recite<sup>s</sup> those words,) at which rate he may well prove that St. Austin contradicts St. Hierome.

I call this mistake gross, because bishop Ussher, in the treatise which the man is here epitomizing, shews that the 191st Sermon *de Tempore*, among the works of St. Austin<sup>t</sup>, (from whence these words are taken,) is not his, but is long ago known to be Pelagius' confession of faith to pope Innocent. And, which makes it the more unpardonable, he himself had a little before<sup>u</sup> followed Ussher in observing that that piece, which among the works of St. Hierome<sup>x</sup> is called *Symboli Explanatio ad Damasum*, is really Pelagius' said confession: and if he had looked into this 191st Sermon *de Tempore*, which he here quotes, he would have seen that and the said *Symboli Explanatio* to be both one. And bishop Ussher, where he observes the one, observes the other. The man that is capable of such palpable mistakes in the main matters which he is arguing, ought, for shame, give over criticising with so censorious a contempt as he does, on the works of men of known and solid learning; where the matter that he remarks is for the most part only some trifling nicety.

III. Pelagius was a Briton born: the only man of that ancient church that ever made a figure in the Roman world. He is supposed to have been called here in his own country, Morgan: because that name in the British language signifies the same that Pelagius does in Latin and Greek, viz. *belonging to the sea*. He lived a good while at Rome, in great credit and esteem for piety, parts, and learning; respected and loved by the most accomplished men of that time, such as St. Austin, Paulinus, Rufinus, &c. Even they that condemned his opinion owned his ingenuity. Most nations that have had any very learned or ingenious man in the most ancient times, keep his works as a monument of remembrance. Pelagius' works were most of them, not all, tinctured with his heresy; and the chief of them are lost. Those that remain, though they are by nigh two hundred years the ancientest of any extant written by a native of this land, yet have not had the favour to be done into English. I have occasion to give by and by his confession of faith

<sup>r</sup> Page 219.

<sup>s</sup> § 29. Notes on Pelagius' Creed, note<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>t</sup> [In the Benedictine edition it is transferred, among other spurious pieces, to the

Appendix of tom. v. p. 388. Sermon. 236.]

<sup>u</sup> Page 180.

<sup>x</sup> [It is printed in tom. xi. p. 146. of the edition published by Vallarsius.]



at large, which is so handsomely drawn up, that it has passed, as was observed before, sometimes for St. Austin's, sometimes for St. Hierome's.

Some late writers do think he was a Scotsman. And Garnier the Jesuit has lately set up that opinion, by running into a mistake<sup>y</sup> of the sense of a place in St. Hierome<sup>z</sup>, which mistake bishop Ussher had rectified long before<sup>a</sup>. All that is in it is this. Cælestius was an Irishman: and they at that time were called *Scoti*, and their country *Scotia*. And therefore of him indeed St. Hierome says<sup>b</sup>, 'he is by origin of the Scotch nation:' and again, '*Scotorum pultibus prægravatus*,' 'having his belly filled, and his head bedulled, with Scotch porridge.' And Dempster<sup>c</sup> the Scot took on him to maintain, that not only he, but a great many others that in old writings are called *Scoti*, were of that Scotland which now goes by that name: whom bishop Ussher does handsomely expose for that mistake. And yet it is followed by Mr. Le Clerc, as to Cælestius. But if that were true, it would not concern Pelagius, whom St. Hierome does at that place distinguish from Cælestius, as Pluto from Cerberus.

All ancient writers style him a Briton: and Dempster himself (using the word improperly) calls him English. And we understand by St. Austin [Ep. 106. *ad Paulinum*], that he was commonly called Pelagius Brito, to distinguish him from another Pelagius of Tarentum. As for the present Scotland, Garnier, and they that take this from him, ought, if they compare the time in which Pelagius lived, to remember that at that time that country was as fruitful of authors as Lapland or Greenland is now.

IV. Pelagius had written some learned works, as Three Books of the Trinity, &c., before<sup>d</sup> he fell into those new opinions against original sin, and against the necessity of God's grace for our doing good works; which were the two chief of the heterodox tenets held by him. And when he had in his own breast entertained them, he at first expressed them sily in discourse among the people, or wrote

<sup>y</sup> [In a tract subjoined to his edition of the theological works of Marius Mercator, fol. Paris, 1673, reprinted in vol. xii. or the Appendix to the Benedictine edition of St. Austin, Dissert. I. cap. iv. p. 66.]

<sup>z</sup> [Epist. ad Ctesiphontem, 133.—Op. tom. i. p. 1032.]

<sup>a</sup> Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. 8. p. 209, ed. 1639. [p. 113, ed. 1687.]

<sup>b</sup> Proëm. in lib. i. et proëm. in lib. iii. Comment. in Jeremiam, [Op. tom. iv. p. 835, 923.]

<sup>c</sup> [Thomæ Demsteri Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Scotorum, 4<sup>o</sup>. Bononiæ 1627.

vid. lib. xv.—In the preface to the valuable reprint of this work by the Bannatyne Club, 2 vols. 4<sup>o</sup>. Edinburgh 1829, Dr. Irving the editor pleasantly but truly remarks, '*Scotorum complures, si fides Demstero habenda, multa literis mandarunt sexcentis ferme annis ante literas in Scotiam invectas.*'—And again, '*Tam portentosam sibi bibliothecam adornaverat Thomas ille noster:—quocunque ferunt pedes, scriptores invenit ille Scotos.*']

<sup>d</sup> Gennadius de Scriptoribus, cap. 42.



them as the objections of other men<sup>e</sup>, (much after the rate as bishop Taylor of late days wrote his *Arguments for Antipædobaptism*,) as if it were only for disputation sake. These his discourses were remembered and more minded afterwards.

So for example, before he declared himself, he wrote a short exposition on St. Paul's Epistles; and in that to the Romans on ch. v. 12 he wrote thus, as St. Austin quotes his words<sup>f</sup>:

' They that are against the derivation of sin [or original sin], endeavour to disprove it thus; "If Adam's sin," say they, "hurts those that do not sin themselves, then Christ's righteousness may profit those that do not believe: for," he says, "they are as much, nay more, saved by one, than they were before dead by one."

' And then say they, "If baptism does cleanse that old offence, [or, take away original sin,] then they that are born of parents both baptized, must be without this sin, for the parents could not transmit that which they had not."

' "This also," say they, "may be added; if the soul be not by propagation, but the flesh only, then that only has original sin, and that only deserves punishment. For it is unjust," say they, "that a soul created but to-day, and that not out of the mass of Adam, should bear the burden of another person's sin committed so long ago."

' They say also, "That it ought by no means to be granted, that God, who forgives us our own sins, should impute to us other people's."

Then St. Austin adds; ' You see Pelagius put all this into his writings, not in his own name, but in the name of others; being so satisfied that this was a novelty, which but now began to make a noise against the old and settled opinion of the church, that he was ashamed or afraid to own it himself. And perhaps he is not of that opinion himself, that a person is born without sin, to whom he confesses baptism (in which remission of sins is granted) to be necessary.' And a little after, having shewn how contrary this opinion is to scripture, he says, ' I believe, a man that is so excellent a Christian, does not at all hold these and the other absurdities that are so perverse and contrary to Christian truth.'

This St. Austin says in a book written anno Domini 412, several  
312. years after Pelagius had wrote his Exposition on the  
(A.D. 412.) Epistles. So that he had not even then absolutely declared himself, at least St. Austin did not know that he had. But

<sup>e</sup> August. de Peccato orig. cap. 21. [§ 23.  
Op. tom. x. p. 262.]

<sup>f</sup> De Peccator. Meritis, lib. iii. cap. 2, 3.  
[Op. tom. x. p. 71, 72.]

afterward, as St. Austin says in a later book, ‘being become a heretic, he maintained these same things with a most resolute obstinacy.’

V. Anno Dom. 410, Rome was taken and sacked by the Goths. Then, or quickly after, Pelagius and Cælestius, who during their living there had privately sowed the seeds of this heresy, departed from thence. They are found to have been both in Africa in the year 411. Pelagius went quickly from thence into the east countries<sup>h</sup>. Cælestius stayed there, and attempted to take priest’s orders in the church of Carthage. But some of the clergy of that church, having heard something of his tenets, insisted that he should be first examined about them. So at an assembly or council held (A. D. 412.) there, anno 412, he was challenged by Paulinus, a deacon of that church, as having maintained several false doctrines, and among the rest these four :

1. ‘That Adam was created mortal, and that whether he had sinned or not, he would have died.
2. ‘That the sin of Adam hurt himself only, and not mankind.
3. ‘That infants new born are in the same state that Adam was before his fall.
4. ‘That a man may be without sin, and keep the commandments of God easily, if he will.’

I had occasion to set down the acts of the council, which contain the accusations and his answers to them, above in ch. v. § 8. If the reader turn back thither, he will see the substance of them to be, that he would not own original sin, though he did not then absolutely deny it: but infant-baptism he confessed to be necessary, and that he had never held otherwise.

He also then put in his plea in writing, (a libellus St. Austin calls it, or confession of his belief,) in which he confessed, ‘That infants have redemption by the baptism of Christ,’ (as the bishops in a council, that was held there five years after, do mention in (A. D. 416) their letter to Innocent<sup>i</sup>.) From which concession St. Austin (who was not at that council) afterward argued, ‘By that word *redemption*, he has stopped up his way [for any farther denial of ‘original sin’]; for, from what are they redeemed, but from the ‘power of Satan<sup>k</sup>?’ &c.

<sup>g</sup> Retractat. lib. 2. c. 33. [Op. tom. i. p. 53.]

<sup>h</sup> Augustin. de Gestis Pelagii, c. 22. [Op. tom. x. p. 216.]

<sup>i</sup> Epist. Synodic. Concilii Carthag. ad Innocent. apud Augustin. Ep. 90. [epist.

175. Op. tom. ii. p. 617. and in the Appendix to tom. x. p. 91, among various documents relating to the Pelagian history.]

<sup>k</sup> Ep. 89. ad Hilarium. [ep. 157. tom. ii. p. 542.]

The issue of the council was, Cælestius was refused, and all that held such opinions condemned. And he went from Carthage, saying, that he would refer himself to Innocent, bishop of Rome; which he never found it for his purpose to do.

VI. About this time, anno 412, St. Austin wrote his first treatise  
 312. against those that held these opinions (who were after-  
 (A. D. 412.) ward called Pelagians; as yet Pelagius himself, though he had set them on foot, did not declare himself: and when St. Austin mentions him in this book, it is with respect, and hoping he would not maintain them). They were much talked of at Carthage, where Pelagius and Cælestius had been: and Marcellinus, a nobleman living at that city, sent to St. Austin to desire his resolution of the difficulties raised about them. It was in answer to that desire that he wrote two books, and, a little after, a third book, (or epistle,) entitled, ‘Of the guilt and forgiveness of sins, and of the baptism of ‘infants<sup>1</sup>.’ The scope of them is to prove the doctrine of original sin to be true, and that chiefly from the baptism of infants; and to assert the necessity of God’s grace, and to answer the objections.

In the first, he discourses of the state of Adam before and after his fall, shews that his seed do derive sin from him, not by imitation only, (as these men explained the Scripture sayings,) but by propagation: that this propagated corruption is in all persons, even in infants that have no actual sin.

He proves this, first by texts of Scripture, then by other arguments; and, among the rest, by this, that infants are by all Christians acknowledged to stand in need of baptism, which must be in them for original sin, since they have no other. He mentions and replies to some answers which the deniers of original sin gave to this last argument, which pressed them very hard.

1. Some said, that infants have actual sin: meaning their peevishness, &c., and that they may have need to be baptized for that<sup>m</sup>. These men he judges unworthy of any answer here, as arguing against plain sense: yet at the end of the book he spends some time in answering them.

VII. 2. Some said, they are baptized, not for ‘forgiveness of sin,’ but that they may be made ‘heirs of the kingdom of heaven<sup>n</sup>.’ It is to be noted, the Pelagians held a middle state between heaven and hell. ‘These men,’ says St. Austin, ‘if they be asked whether ‘infants not baptized, and not made heirs of the kingdom, have yet ‘the benefit of eternal salvation at the resurrection of the dead, ‘*laborant vehementer, nec exitum inveniunt*, are at a great plunge, and

<sup>1</sup> [Op. tom. x. p. 1, &c.]

<sup>m</sup> Cap. 17.

<sup>n</sup> Cap. 18.

‘ can find no way out of it. Quis enim Christianorum ferat, cum  
 ‘ dicitur ad æternam salutem posse quenquam pervenire, si non re-  
 ‘ nascatur in Christo, quod per baptismum fieri voluit?’ &c. ‘ For  
 ‘ what Christian man can endure to hear it said, that any person  
 ‘ may come to eternal salvation, that is not regenerated in Christ,  
 ‘ which he has ordered to be done by baptism?’ &c.

And whereas these men distinguish between salvation and the kingdom of heaven, and said, children might be saved without baptism, though not come to the kingdom of heaven; he brings in that text, Tit. iii. 5, *He saved us by the washing of regeneration*, &c. As he does in a following chapter that of St. Peter, 1 Epist. iii. 21, *Baptism doth save us*. He proceeds, ‘ Who dares to affirm that infants may  
 ‘ be saved without that regeneration, as if Christ had not died for  
 ‘ them? For Christ died for sinners; and if these, who, it is plain,  
 ‘ have committed no sin in their own life, are not held captive under  
 ‘ the original bond of sin neither; how did Christ, who died for  
 ‘ sinners, die for them? If they are not diseased with any sickness  
 ‘ of original sin, why are they carried to Christ the Physician, to re-  
 ‘ ceive the sacrament of their eternal salvation, by the godly fear of  
 ‘ their friends that run with them to it? Why is it not said to them  
 ‘ in the church, “ Carry back from hence these innocent creatures:  
 ‘ the whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick:  
 ‘ Christ came not to call the righteous, but sinners?” *Nunquam*  
 ‘ *dictum est, nunquam dicitur, nunquam omnino dicetur in ecclesia*  
 ‘ *Christi tale commentum*. So odd a thing never was said, never is  
 ‘ said, nor ever will be said, in the church of Christ.’

Concerning what was then said, or what had ever been said, St. Austin was a proper judge: but we find now, that for what would be said in aftertimes he did not guess altogether right, if he meant that no Christians would ever say so.

Then he answers the objections of those who said, if infants were sinners, it were needful for them to repent; which since they cannot do, it is a sign that baptism is not in their case used for forgiveness of sin. His answer is, ‘ That in like manner as they profess faith by  
 ‘ the words of those that bring them, they do also go for penitents,  
 ‘ when by the words of the same bearers they do renounce the devil  
 ‘ and the world.’

Whereas they objected<sup>p</sup>, if all infants are sinful, what justice is it that some should happen to have baptism, and so be forgiven; and others, no more sinful than they, should miss it, and so be condemned? he desires them to answer first, if all infants are sinless,



what justice is it that some should happen to have baptism, and so be admitted into the kingdom of heaven : and others, as sinless as they, should miss it, and so be excluded ? He teaches that all such things are to be referred to the unsearchable wisdom of God.

VIII. He refutes<sup>q</sup> those that, knowing not what else to say, ventured upon the exploded opinion of Plato and Origen ; that the souls of infants have lived before in another state or world, and have sinned there : and so pleaded that possibly it is for those sins that they are here baptized. He stops their mouths with that scripture, Rom. ix. 11, *The children being not yet born, having done neither good nor evil*, &c., and with several other arguments : but that one is enough.

Having occasionally said<sup>r</sup> that infants, till they are baptized, do *abide in darkness* ; he recites an objection of some, that all that are born are enlightened, from that text<sup>s</sup>, *That was the true light that lighteth every man* [or person] *that cometh into the world*. Whereupon he says, ‘ If that be so : it is a strange thing that they being enlightened by the only Son, who was in the beginning with God, ‘ God the Word, should not be admitted into the kingdom of God, ‘ nor be heirs of God, nor joint-heirs with Christ. For that this ‘ is not granted them but by baptism, even they that are of this ‘ opinion do confess.’

IX. He cites abundance of places<sup>t</sup> of scripture to shew that all that Christ came to save, as Mediator, are by the scripture supposed to have been in a lost condition : he came, he took flesh, he submitted himself to the form of a servant, died, &c., that he might quicken those that were dead, save those that were lost, free those that were in slavery, redeem those that were in captivity, enlighten those that were in darkness, rescue those that were under the power of Satan, &c. From whence he says it follows, ‘ that they do not ‘ belong to this dispensation of Christ, fulfilled by his humiliation, ‘ who have no need of life, salvation, deliverance, redemption, &c. ‘ And consequently baptism is not necessary for those who have no ‘ need of the benefit of forgiveness and reconciliation by the Mediator. “ Porro quia parvulos baptizandos esse concedunt, qui ‘ contra auctoritatem universæ ecclesiæ, proculdubio per dominum et ‘ apostolos traditam, venire non possunt,” &c. Now then, since they ‘ grant that infants must be baptized, as not being able to oppose ‘ the authority of the whole church, which was doubtless delivered by ‘ our Lord and his apostles ; they must consequently grant, that ‘ they stand in need of the benefits of the Mediator : that being

<sup>q</sup> Cap. 22.<sup>r</sup> Cap. 25.<sup>s</sup> John i. 9.<sup>t</sup> Cap. 26, 27.

‘ offered by the sacrament and by the charity of the faithful, and so  
 ‘ being incorporated into Christ’s body, they may be reconciled to  
 ‘ God: that in him they may be quickened, saved, delivered, re-  
 ‘ deemed, enlightened. From what, but from death, wickedness,  
 ‘ guilt, slavery, and darkness of sins? Which since they have com-  
 ‘ mitted none in their own life at that age, there remains [nothing  
 ‘ that they can be guilty of but] original sin.’

X. He disputes largely<sup>u</sup> against their opinion of a middle state, proving, ‘ That there is no salvation but in the kingdom of God ;—  
 ‘ nor any middle place where any one can be, except with the Devil,  
 ‘ who is not with Christ. Hence our Lord himself, that he might  
 ‘ rase out of the minds of mistaken men any opinion of I know not  
 ‘ what middle state, which some men go about to attribute to unbap-  
 ‘ tized infants ; as, that they shall, being sinless, be in eternal life,  
 ‘ but not being baptized, shall not be with Christ in his kingdom ;  
 ‘ gave this definitive sentence to stop their mouths, *He that is not*  
 ‘ *with me is against me.* Give us therefore an infant : if he be with  
 ‘ Christ already, what is he baptized for ? But if, as the truth is, he  
 ‘ be therefore baptized, that he may be with Christ, then it is sure  
 ‘ that before he is baptized he is not with Christ.’

Though St. Austin here in the heat of this dispute do once use this expression, of unbaptized infants being with the Devil, since by the Pelagians’ confession they are not with Christ ; yet he means but a very moderate degree of condemnation or misery : not like that of wicked men ; but such as may be preferable to no being at all. As I shall shew hereafter<sup>x</sup>.

He goes on<sup>y</sup> to prove his point from the name or title given by our Saviour to baptism, John iii. 5, *Except one be born again* [or regenerated], &c., he says ; ‘ These men, if they were not moved [or convinced] by this sentence, would determine that infants are not  
 ‘ to be baptized at all.’ And he argues, ‘ Why born again, but to be  
 ‘ renewed ? Renewed from what, but from the old nature, *a vetus-*  
 ‘ *tate ?* From what old nature, but that wherein our old nature is  
 ‘ crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed<sup>z</sup> ?’

He confirms the same sense by the following parts of our Saviour’s discourse with Nicodemus<sup>a</sup>, *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, i. e. as St. Austin takes it, is corrupt or sinful ; *and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit*, i. e. is renewed or sanctified.

XI. He takes notice<sup>b</sup>, that those particular men at Carthage, of whom Marcellinus had wrote to him, did grant, ‘ that in baptism

<sup>u</sup> Cap. 28.<sup>x</sup> Part ii. ch. 6. § 5.<sup>y</sup> Cap. 30, 31, &c.<sup>z</sup> Rom. vi. 6.<sup>a</sup> John iii. 6.<sup>b</sup> Cap. 34.

‘there is forgiveness of sins given to infants; not that they have ‘any original sin, but they have sinned since they were born.’ He takes notice how much these differ from the others, whom he had been hitherto refuting, and one of whose books he had seen. ‘The ‘one,’ says he, ‘minding the scriptures, and the authority of the ‘whole church, and the form of the sacrament itself, see well that ‘baptism in infants is for remission of sins: but cannot see, or will ‘not own, that it is original sin. The other, considering human ‘nature,—see well, as it is easy to do, that that age cannot in its ‘own life have contracted any sin; but rather than confess original ‘sin, say there is no sin at all in infants.’ He bids these two parties first agree among themselves: for if each grant to the other that which they urge of truth, they will both hold the whole truth.

However, he does condescend<sup>c</sup>, for the sake of these latter, to shew at large how impossible it is for a new-born infant, that has no knowledge of good or evil, to be guilty of actual sin. But it seems a flat and needless discourse: because, as he there observes, ‘a man ‘is never more troubled to find what to say, than when the thing he ‘would prove is of itself plainer than any thing he can say.’

What we can observe out of these passages of the first book (besides what has been observed before) is the tenet of Pelagius and his followers. They denied original sin. The catholics, among other arguments against them, urged this; that infants have sin, is proved from the need they have of baptism: and other than original sin they cannot have. The Pelagians did not pretend to deny the necessity of infant-baptism: which had been highly for their purpose to do, if they had thought they could have justified such a denial. And when St. Austin mentions it as a practice of the whole church from the apostles’ time; they do not deny it, but own it, as we shall see hereafter: only they said, baptism, in the case of an infant, is not for ‘forgiveness of sin,’ (though they were driven from this hold too afterward, as we shall see,) but to procure the child an ‘entrance ‘into the kingdom of heaven.’ For they held that an infant dying unbaptized shall be raised again, and live eternally in a certain middle state, without punishment, as having no sin; but not enjoying the kingdom of heaven, as being not baptized into Christ. But that a baptized infant shall go into the kingdom of heaven.

XII. As for that plea, that infants have actual sin, and are baptized for that; it was the tenet only of some ignorant persons among them, whom Marcellinus had mentioned. Pelagius and

<sup>c</sup> Cap. 35.



Cælestius did not stand to that; but they held for a while stiff in their refusal to own baptism of infants to be for forgiveness.

Cælestius had, as I said before, used the word *redemption* as applied to infants by their baptism. And the same thing St. Austin observes here<sup>d</sup>, ‘they grant redemption to be necessary for them, as  
‘is contained in a very short book of one of them, who yet would  
‘not plainly express there the forgiveness of any sin.’ And again<sup>e</sup>,  
‘though they have not been willing in their writings plainly to own  
‘forgiveness of sins to be necessary for infants, yet they have owned  
‘redemption to be needful for them.’

XIII. The second book of this work is on another subject, viz. St. Austin’s resolution of this question, put to him by Marcellinus, ‘whether there is, or ever was, or ever will be, any man without sin, beside our Saviour Christ.’

As the Pelagians denied the original corruption of our nature, so accordingly they magnified the present freedom and goodness of it: and some at this time went so far, or, as St. Austin here expresses it<sup>f</sup>, ‘presumed so much on the freedom of man’s will, as to be of  
‘opinion, that we have no need to be assisted by God to avoid sin,  
‘after he has once granted to our nature the power of freewill.’ In confuting this opinion of theirs, he has not much occasion to speak of infant-baptism. So I should pass it by; but the indignation to see the ancient fathers so misrepresented as they are by some modern writers<sup>g</sup>, (with what intent they do this, God knows,) forces me to give in short the substance of his answer to this question: that it may appear how falsely he and St. Hierome are charged to contradict one another in the substantial part of their answer.

St. Austin divides this question into four<sup>h</sup>:

1. Whether the thing be possible, viz. for a man to live without sin?

To this he answers, ‘I shall confess it to be possible by the grace  
‘of God, and the freewill of man:’ explaining himself so, as that God can, if he please, give such a measure of grace, as that a man should ever choose and do what is best.

2. Whether this do ever come to pass?

*Ans.* ‘I do not believe there is any such thing; I rather believe  
‘the scripture, which says, *Enter not into judgment with thy servant;*  
‘*for in thy sight shall no man living be justified*<sup>i</sup>.’ Here he produces many texts proving all men to be sinners.

<sup>d</sup> Cap. 34.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 36.  
<sup>h</sup> Cap. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 2.  
<sup>i</sup> Cap. 7.

<sup>g</sup> [See above, p. 217.]



3. If it be possible so to be, and yet never be so; what is the reason?

*Ans.* ‘I might answer easily and truly thus; Because men will not. But if I am asked why they will not? there is a great deal to be said. Yet leaving room for a more diligent inquiry, I shall answer to this also in short. Men will not do what is good, either because they are not convinced that it is good, or because it does not please them.’

4. Whether there be, or ever can be, a man that has never had any sin?

He answers, No; because, suppose any man should by God’s grace arrive to that perfection as not to sin any more; yet having been conceived in sin, it will be true of him that he had sins before he was converted to that newness of life<sup>k</sup>.

He proves these his answers largely, and answers the objections raised from 1 John v. 18. *He that is born of God sinneth not*; and from what is said of Job, and of Zacharias and Elizabeth being blameless, upright, &c.

And whereas this sort of men did use to catch and baffle the people with such logical quirks as these, ‘Si nolumus, non peccamus:’ ‘We do not sin whether we will or no:’ and, ‘possibilia Deus mandata dedit, aut impossibilia,’ &c. ‘The things that God has set us to do are either possible things or impossible. If possible, we may perform them if we will; if impossible, then we are in no fault for not doing impossible things.’ From whence they concluded that it was certainly true, which they maintained, ‘That a man may be without sin, and keep God’s commandments easily, if he will.’

St. Austin answers thus, ‘They seem to themselves witty when they say (as if any of us did not know that) that we do not sin whether we will or no; and that God would never command a man that which is impossible to human will. But they do not see, that to overcome some things, which are either corruptly desired or corruptly feared, there is occasion for the strong, and sometimes the utmost effort of the will [or resolution], which he foresaw we should not perfectly exert in all cases, who would have it truly foretold by the prophet, *In thy sight shall no man living be justified.*’

XIV. I recite this, to shew that the grounds on which St. Austin opposed this presumptuous doctrine are not different from those on which St. Hierome did; as the author I spake of before would make

<sup>j</sup> Cap. 17.

<sup>k</sup> Cap. 20.

<sup>l</sup> Hieron. Dialog. contra Pelagianos, lib. i. [sect. 10. et 21; Op. tom. ii. p. 688.]

us believe<sup>m</sup>. For the answer given by St. Hierome to the same cavils is this: he had recited the objection about possible and impossible: he had shewed that some men that are commendable for one quality are faulty for another; and that none is perfect in all. Then to the dilemma he answers, 'They are possible things which God has commanded, I own it; but even for these possible things we cannot every one of us have all of them; and this, not by reason of the weakness [or inability] of nature, that you may not rail; but because of the weariness of the mind, which cannot have all virtues together, and keep them always. And if you will reproach the Creator for that because he has made you such a creature as does flag or grow weary, I will tell you again, it will be a smarter reprehension of him, if you find fault with him that he has not made you a god. But you will say, "If I cannot do it, I am in no sin." You are in a sin. Why could not you do that which another could do? And again, he, in comparison of whom you are worse, will be a sinner himself in comparison of some other, or of you in some other quality<sup>n</sup>.'

This is the saying of St. Hierome, which that writer instances in<sup>o</sup> as contrary to St. Austin's doctrine, but proves it no other way than by shewing that Pelagius (whom he takes to be St. Austin) rails against it. The answers of the one and of the other of these fathers are for substance the same, viz. That though it be, logically speaking, true, which the Pelagians urged, 'that we may do all that we can do,' (the denial of it being a contradiction,) yet there is no man living but at some times he is slothful or weary, or not so watchful against sin and passion, as he himself will confess afterward he might have been. And this comes upon a man in spite of the firmest resolution he can have settled beforehand.

The same author in the same treatise represents the tenets of Pelagius and St. Austin very partially; and after such a manner as if St. Austin had produced no other proof against Pelagius of the need we all stand in of God's assisting grace in order to live well, than what was fetched from the doctrine of absolute and particular predestination. 'The difference then,' says he<sup>p</sup>, 'between St. Austin and Pelagius in this matter was this, that the first believed that since the sin of Adam his posterity are so corrupted, that they are born with such dispositions to evil, as do necessarily carry them to sin; that if God will bring any one to good, he must for every

<sup>m</sup> § 2. p. 352.

<sup>o</sup> Bibliothèque Univ. tom. viii. p. 219.

<sup>n</sup> Dial. 1. [sect. 23. tom. ii. p. 706.]

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. tom. viii. p. 195.

‘good action give him a grace, which shall inevitably make him will that which is good. And for the rest, those to whom he does not give such a grace are damned. God, by a wisdom which we understand not, having a mind that mankind should be born under an inevitable necessity of sinning, and of being accordingly tormented with eternal punishments, without delivering from this doleful necessity any more than a very small number of persons to whom he gives an invincible grace.’

Now besides that the opinion of St. Austin concerning predestination is here very invidiously and disadvantageously represented, and that of Pelagius is as much smoothed over; what an unfair account is it of the controversy between them, to make it turn upon that point? St. Austin brought many other proofs and reasons in this dispute, such as are owned to be valid, not only by those that approve the opinion he held about predestination, but by those that dislike it. God forbid all should be Pelagians that have not the same conceptions that St. Austin had about that other matter; Pelagianism has been accounted an heretical doctrine in all ages of the church, and in all particular churches; even in those in which the doctrine of predestination has been variously explained. It is one thing thankfully to own the assistance of God’s Spirit in all the good purposes and spiritual strength we have; and another to determine that God limits this grace and assistance to a certain number of particular persons, or gives it in an irresistible degree. Or, to speak plainly, there is a great difference between the Arminian and the Pelagian tenets. Concerning the first, most men are now agreed to bear with one another in any difference about them: but they that would obliterate the doctrine of original sin, and of the necessity of God’s grace, we know not whither they would lead us, nor what part of our religion they will leave us.

The Arminians or Remonstrants did, at the synod of Dort, exhibit an account of their tenets in this matter, wherein they frankly confess God’s grace to be necessary, not only as it illuminates our understanding, but also ‘*voluntati vires conferat ad non peccandum*,’ ‘it gives strength to the will to avoid sin:’ and not only to teach us what we ought to do, but also, ‘*ut quod factu opus est, facere diligamus et valeamus*,’ ‘that we may be able to do, and may love to do, that which we ought:’ which was the thing required of Pelagius to confess, and on the owning whereof he would have been acquitted. They do also shew how far they differ from the Pelagians (and even from the Semi-pelagians) in all those other things for which either of the said parties were condemned by the church



of that time. This they do in the declaration of their tenet on the third and fourth of the five articles<sup>q</sup>. What then makes this man (who professes that way) to talk of Pelagianism as if it were so tacked to Arminianism that St. Austin could not confute the one without confuting the other? And to represent St. Hierome, who confuted Pelagius without having recourse to St. Austin's opinion of predestination, as a Semi-pelagian<sup>r</sup>?

XV. Whereas the chief point on which Pelagius was condemned, was his denial of any such thing as an internal grace of God's Spirit moving and inclining the heart to faith, love, obedience, &c., which we ought to pray to God for: this historian, citing Petavius<sup>s</sup> for it, reckons up six sorts of grace which Pelagius owned: 1. God's grace in giving us a freewill: and, 2. In giving a sinner pardon for sins past, to encourage him: and, 3. In giving his law: and, 4. The grace of baptism, wherein an adult person that has sinned obtains remission of sins and the inheritance of God's kingdom: an infant has no remission of sins as having no sin in his opinion, but yet is put into a better state, being made an heir of God's kingdom: and, 5. In giving the kingdom of heaven as a reward to encourage us. These five nobody accused him of denying. But heret<sup>t</sup> he is said to have owned another sort of grace, viz. 'The internal illumination of our spirit,' which Pelagius expresses in this wise:

'I confess that grace consists not only in the law, but in God's assistance: for God assists us by his doctrine and his revelation, in opening the eyes of our hearts; in declaring to us the things that shall be hereafter, that we may not be fixed to the present things; in discovering to us the snares of the Devil; in enlightening us by the manifold and unspeakable gift of his heavenly grace. Does he that speaks thus, think you, deny the grace of God? Does he not confess at once both God's grace and man's freewill<sup>u</sup>?'

It is true, St. Austin does quote these and such other words out of Pelagius' third book of Freewill. But he shews at the same place, that they are used by him only for a blind, and that his other sayings in the same book are such as will not suffer these to be understood in a catholic sense. Both St. Hierome and St. Austin give this account of him, (which they prove by several instances,) that though he held those singular opinions, and propagated them

<sup>q</sup> Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Ministrorum Remonstrantium, &c. Herderwici, 1620. pt. ii. p. 22, &c.

<sup>r</sup> Biblioth. Univ. tom. viii. p. 194.

<sup>s</sup> [De Pelagianorum et Semi-Pelagianorum dogmatum historia, cap. 2. sect. 4.]

See Petavii Dogmata theologica, fol. Antwerpiae, 1700, tom. iii. p. 305.]

<sup>t</sup> Biblioth. Univ. tom. viii. p. 198.

<sup>u</sup> De Gratia Christi, lib. i. c. 7. [Op. tom. x. p. 233.]



privately in the minds of his followers, yet he was very unwilling to be convicted of so doing; and therefore used in his writings a great deal of equivocation. He would say such things as looked like an owning of internal grace; but still would take care to place his words so as that he could, when occasion required, explain them to mean only that grace or mercy of God by which he gives us good rules, doctrines, revelations, promises, &c. And so here he limits (as St. Austin observes) all that he speaks of, to doctrine and revelation; and he does not name it *internal*, as Mr. Le Clerc does.

St. Austin shews him to have used the same artifice through all his four books of Freewill; which he wrote on purpose to vindicate his reputation: and yet even there he never spoke home to the owning of God's grace in the catholic sense, but often to the denying of it. He says there, in the same book out of which the foresaid specious words are quoted<sup>x</sup>, 'We distinguish between these three things, and place them each in their due order; in the first place we rank *posse*, the power of doing any thing; in the second, *velle*, the will to do it; in the third, *esse*, the being of the thing. We say the power is in our nature; the will, *in arbitrio*, in our choice; the being, in the effect. The first, i. e. the power, properly belongs to God, who has given it to his creature; but the other two, i. e. the will and the being, are to be referred to the man, because they come from the fountain of freewill.'

And in another place<sup>y</sup>, he says by way of objection to his own assertion:

*Obj.* 'But how then shall that of the apostle stand good, *It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do*?'

*Ans.* 'He worketh in us to will that which is good, to will that which is holy; inasmuch as, by the greatness of the future glory, and his promise of reward, he encourages us, who are given to earthly desires, and do love only things before our eyes as brute beasts; inasmuch as he raises our drowsy will by the revelation of his wisdom; inasmuch as he advises us to every good thing,' &c.

All this St. Austin shews to be far short of what was necessary for him to say, if he would clear himself, because it makes God to work upon our wills only outwardly by proposals: and says, 'Let him once at last own that grace, by which the greatness of the future glory is not only promised to us, but believed and hoped for by us; and by which his wisdom is not only revealed to us, but loved by us; and by which *non suadet solum omne quod bonum est, verum*

<sup>x</sup> Pelagius pro libero Arbitrio, lib. iii. apud August. de Gratia Christi, lib. i. cap. 4.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. cap. 10.

<sup>z</sup> Phil. iii. 12.

'*et persuadetur*, we are not only advised to every good thing, but 'prevailed on to follow it.' Then, having commented upon that text<sup>a</sup>, *No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him*; he adds, 'This sort of grace Pelagius ought to own, if he 'have a mind, not only to be called, but to be, a Christian.'

But the event proved, that he would never own that sort of grace; and that the latent meaning of all his coloured speeches was no other than what St. Austin and his other opponents took it to be. For when so much offence was taken at him, that nothing was to be expected but excommunication; Cælestius and he being then in the East, applied themselves to the church of Rome, to see if the apology they made for themselves would pass there. Cælestius came in person, and delivered in a confession of his faith: Pelagius came not, but sent one, (of which I shall by and by give a copy,) and a letter with it. There happened to be then a weak bishop of that church, Zosimus, who was for the present so far imposed on by their pretences, and was so incompetent a judge of this question, and of the other about original sin, (as I shew more particularly<sup>b</sup> hereafter,) that he took what they said for orthodox, and blamed their accusers as having slandered them; though his predecessor Innocent had de-

<sup>317.</sup> clared an ill opinion of them. But the African bishops, (A.D. 417.) being then in council at Carthage, sent their synodical epistle to Zosimus, advertising him of the craft and equivocation used by those men; and shewing by instances, wherein his examination of them was short of what it ought to have been: and that Cælestius ought particularly to recant the erroneous positions in his confession. Upon the coming of this letter, when Cælestius was summoned to appear<sup>c</sup>, 'That by his direct and plain answer either 'his hypocrisy or else his amendment might be made manifest, and 'be no longer ambiguous; he withdrew himself, and would not 'come to the hearing.' So far St. Austin's words are: but Mercator gives this further circumstance<sup>d</sup>, that he ran away from Rome.

This passage of the history Mr. Le Clerc leaves out, which none that pretended to write this history ever left out before; for it is a plain proof that the opinion against the grace of God, which the catholics charged the Pelagians with, was their real opinion; and not wrongfully affixed on them by taking their words in a worse sense than they meant them, as he would have it believed.

The issue was, the bishops of Africa continued in their resolution,

<sup>a</sup> John vi. 44.

<sup>b</sup> § 33.

<sup>c</sup> August. contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum, lib. ii. c. 3. [Op. tom. x. p. 433.]

<sup>d</sup> [Marii Mercatoris Commonitorium

super nomine Pelagii, Cælestii, et Juliani, eorumque hæresi, cap. i. This work is printed in the collection of Councils, ed. Labbe, ii. p. 1512. ed. Mansi, iv. p. 291.]

<sup>318.</sup> and the next year sent a peremptory letter to Zosimus, (A.D. 418.) (who had done all he could to have these men acquitted,) that they did determine, *Constituimus*, &c. ‘That the sentence pronounced against Pelagius and Cælestius, by the reverend bishop ‘Innocent, from the see of the blessed apostle Peter, do stand firm, ‘so long till they do by a plain confession own that we are in every ‘action assisted by the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, ‘not only to understand, but also to practise righteousness; in such ‘wise as that without it we are not able to do, to speak, to think, or ‘to have any thing of true and sincere piety.’ And Zosimus at last complied with them, and joined in giving the same sentence: and so, as Prosper tells us<sup>f</sup>, did all the world.

They were, as appears by St. Austin’s words<sup>g</sup>, ‘either to do ‘penance,’ [viz. recant their heretical opinions, whereof this of denying God’s grace, and the other of original sin, were the chief,] ‘or, if they refused that, to stand condemned’ [or excommunicated]. There were also imperial edicts against them.

XVI. All that we hear of afterwards, that tended towards recantation, was this: Pinianus, and Albina, and Melania, being <sup>319.</sup> (A.D. 419.) then in the East, where Pelagius was, wrote to St. Austin, that they ‘had dealt with him<sup>h</sup> to condemn [or recant] under his ‘hand all the things that were objected to him; and that [as to ‘God’s grace] he hath said in their hearing, thus, “I do anathematize [or renounce] any one that says or thinks that the grace of ‘God, by which Christ came into the world to save sinners, is not ‘necessary both every hour and moment, and also in every action; ‘and they that take away [or deny] this grace, are to have [or may ‘they have] eternal punishment.”’

But St. Austin in answer<sup>i</sup> shews them, that these words are capable of the same equivocation he was wont to use: that probably by ‘the grace of God by which Christ came to save sinners,’ he meant nothing but the ‘pardon of sins,’ or, the ‘example of Christ,’ the consideration of which was always necessary: that he had before

<sup>315.</sup> in the synod of Diospolis said as much as this comes to: (A.D. 415.) for that being there accused of holding, ‘that the grace of ‘God is not given in every action, but does consist in our freewill, ‘or in the law and doctrine,’ and, ‘that the grace of God is given ‘according to our deserts;’ and the proof brought against him being this, that Cælestius, who was his disciple, had written such

<sup>e</sup> Prosper contra Cassianum Collatorem, cap. 10. [p. 103, ed. Paris, 1671.]

<sup>f</sup> Chronic. ad ann. 418.

<sup>g</sup> De Peccato originali, cap. 22.

<sup>h</sup> Augustin. de Gratia Christi, cap. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. cap. 3.



things: he answered, ‘Whether these are Cælestius’ sayings or not, let them look to it that say they are his. I never held so, and I do anathematize any one that holds so.’ And yet that after that, he had in his books of Freewill shewn that he had really no other sentiments than such as he seemed then to condemn.

So this did not avail him. He knew well enough what words to have expressed himself in, so as to satisfy the church; but he would not use them. St. Austin told him<sup>k</sup> that ‘inasmuch as the question about reconciling man’s freewill and God’s grace is so intricate; that while one is asserted, the other may seem to be denied; if he would grant that God does not only give us a power of doing well, but does also assist us in the willing and doing of it, (which by the way, is what I shewed before that the Remonstrants do, or at least did freely own,) the controversy would be at an end.’

But he would never say so. He continued excommunicate, and seems to have lived obscurely all the rest of his time.

After all, it is not material to us, whether he was guilty, or whether his accusers were mistaken in his sense; (it were to be wished he could have been shewn to have been guiltless,) were it not that some nowadays, that have a mind to set up the same opinions to a much worse purpose than ever Pelagius did, do go about to retrieve the credit of them by discrediting the catholic church of that time.

That which St. Austin says to Pelagius, on this account of denying God’s grace, may be applied to some of them on account (not only of that, but also) of an article of a higher nature, which they are supposed likewise not to believe. ‘He has not thought fit any where to own that we, when we pray, are assisted by God’s grace that we may not sin; and if he does notwithstanding in his own mind believe this, he must pardon those that suspect otherwise: for he himself causes this suspicion, who, when he lies under so much obloquy on that account, will believe this, and yet will not confess it. What great matter were it for him to say this, especially where he undertakes to handle and explain that point, &c. ? Why should he there defend nature only<sup>l</sup>,’ &c. ?

XVII. I have recited what I mean to do of the dispute concerning God’s grace altogether, that it may give no interruption to what remains to be said of the other, concerning original sin, and the occasions thence taken to speak of infant-baptism.

In the third of those books, *Of the Guilt and Forgiveness of Sins*,

<sup>k</sup> Augustin. de Gratia Christi, cap. 47.

<sup>l</sup> Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, cap. 59. [Op. x. p. 157.]



and Baptism of Infants, St. Austin having in the foregoing chapters recited several interpretations, of which those texts, Rom. v. 12, 13, 14, &c., are capable, concludes in the fifth chapter, that whichever of them be taken, the words ‘can have no other sense but such an one by which it has come to pass that the whole church has from of old constantly held that *fidel* (or baptized) infants do obtain remission of original sin by the baptism of Christ.’

Then he recites a large piece of the epistle of St. Cyprian to Fidus, which I gave a copy of in ch. vi. and observes how he there takes the doctrine of original sin in infants for a known and undoubted thing; and by it proves (what was then by Fidus questioned) that an infant may and must be baptized before the eighth day, if need require. Then he adds<sup>m</sup>:

‘And now some people, by the boldness of I know not what disputing humour, go about to represent that as uncertain which our ancestors made use of as a most certain thing whereby to resolve some things that seemed uncertain. For, when this began first to be disputed, I know not: but this I know, that holy Hierome, whose pains and fame for excellent learning in ecclesiastical matters is at this day so great, does also make use of this as a thing most certain, to resolve some questions in his books,’ &c. Then having quoted some passages out of St. Hierome on Jonah, he proceeds, ‘If we could with convenience come to ask that most learned man, how many writers of Christian dissertations and interpreters of holy scripture in both languages could he recount, who from the time that Christ’s church has been founded, have held no otherwise, have received no other doctrine from their predecessors, nor left any other to their successors? For my part (though my reading is much less than his) I do not remember that I ever heard any other thing from any Christians that received the Old and New Testament, *Non solum in catholica ecclesia, verum etiam in qualibet haresi vel schismate constitutis*: neither from such as were of the catholic church, nor from such as belonged to any sect or schism. *Non memini me aliud legisse*, &c. I do not remember that I ever read otherwise in any writer that I could ever find treating of these matters, that followed the canonical scriptures or did mean or did pretend to do so. From whence it is that this trouble is started up upon us, I know not; but a little while ago, when I was there at Carthage, I just cursorily heard some transient discourse of some people that were talking that infants are not baptized for that reason that they may receive remission of

<sup>m</sup> Cap. 6. [sect. 12. Op. tom. x. 77.]

‘ sins, but that they may be sanctified in Christ. Though I was  
 ‘ something startled at the novelty, yet because it was not seasonable  
 ‘ then to enter into any discourse against it, and because they were  
 ‘ not persons of any such rank as to be much taken notice of; it  
 ‘ passed over with me as a thing forgotten, or not minded. And lo,  
 ‘ now it is a thing maintained against the church with ardent en-  
 ‘ deavours; it is even by writing transmitted to memory; it is come  
 ‘ to that difficulty that the brethren are fain to ask our opinions of  
 ‘ the matter; and we find a necessity of disputing and writing  
 ‘ against it.’

This testimony of St. Austin must needs be looked on as a very considerable evidence. He declares, he never met with any Christian, either churchman or sectary; nor with any writer that owned the scripture, who taught any other doctrine, but that infants are baptized for pardon of sin. Much less then had he known or heard of any that denied that they are to be baptized at all. And they had then, as I observed before, but 300 years to look back to the times of the apostles. And St. Austin, though he speak modestly of himself as to learning, had studied the church history so well, that in a few years after this, he published that his History of all the Sects or Opinions that were, or had been in Christendom; out of which I quote some things in another chapter<sup>n</sup>.

XVIII. To that objection of Pelagius, ‘ If baptism do take away  
 ‘ original sin, then such children as are born of parents both bap-  
 ‘ tized, must be without that sin;’ St. Austin answers to this purpose<sup>o</sup>, That an error is often strengthened by putting alien and intricate questions about the matter, which is an easy thing in most matters to do. ‘ Yet,’ says he, ‘ if I had this cause to manage  
 ‘ against such men as did either deny that infants are to be baptized,  
 ‘ or did say that it is needless to baptize them, for that they being  
 ‘ born of *fidel* [or baptized] persons were necessarily partakers of  
 ‘ their parents’ privilege; then I ought to take more pains in con-  
 ‘ futing this opinion.’ Such persons (as he shews at large) would have need to be put in mind, that as a circumcised parent begets an uncircumcised son; and wheat that has been cleansed from the chaff, does, if it be sowed, produce wheat with chaff on it: so a parent that has been spiritually cleansed begets a son that resembles him, not according to that state that he is in by spiritual regeneration, but according to the state he was in by carnal generation.

‘ But now,’ says he<sup>p</sup>, ‘ since we have to do with such as do confess  
 ‘ that the children of baptized persons are to be baptized; how much

<sup>n</sup> Ch. 21.<sup>o</sup> Augustin. de Gratia Christi, cap. 8.<sup>p</sup> Cap. 9.

‘better is it to say thus to them, You that do affirm that of parents  
‘cleansed from the stain of sin, such children should be born as are  
‘without sin, how is it that you do not mind that at the same rate  
‘you might say that of Christian parents there should be born  
‘Christian children? And then, why do you determine that they are  
‘to be baptized?’

XIX. And having afterward<sup>q</sup> on this occasion mentioned that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Now are your children holy, &c.*, he refers to the exposition of it which Pelagius had given, and the like to which he himself had given in a former treatise<sup>r</sup> which I recited before<sup>s</sup>, and says, that it must be understood so, or else in another sense which he there gives, (relating to the forbearance of the use of the marriage-bed during the woman’s uncleanness,) or else in some other sense of which we may not be certain. And then adds,

‘*Illud tamen sine dubitatione tenendum est, quæcunque illa  
‘sanctificatio sit, non valere ad Christianos faciendos, atque ad  
‘dimittenda peccata, nisi Christiana et ecclesiastica institutione  
‘sacramentis efficiantur fideles. Nam nec,*’ &c.

‘But that is to be held without any doubt, that whatever that  
‘holiness [or sanctification] be; it is not available to the making  
‘of them Christians, or to the pardon of sins, unless they be made  
‘fidels by the institution [or order] of Christ and the church, and  
‘by the sacraments. For neither are unbelieving husbands or wives,  
‘how holy and just partners soever they have, cleansed from the  
‘iniquity which keeps them from the kingdom of God, and brings  
‘them to damnation; nor are infants, of how holy and just parents  
‘soever they come, pardoned the guilt of original sin; unless they  
‘(i. e. the one and the other) be baptized in Christ.’

One may here in short confer together the several comments of the ancients on this text; *The unbelieving husband is sanctified* [or, an unbelieving husband has been sanctified] *by his wife, &c., else were your children unclean; but now they are holy.* They do, most of them, and those the most ancient, make that holiness of the children relate to their baptism, as given, or to be given, before they are actually holy.

1. St. Austin in a former book<sup>t</sup>, interprets, ‘has been sanctified,  
296. i. e. has been brought to the faith.’ And, ‘*Now are your*  
(A.D. 396.) ‘*children holy, i. e. Now are they baptized.*’ And he there gives the grounds of that interpretation, as may be seen by turning

<sup>q</sup> Cap. 12.<sup>s</sup> Ch. xv. sect. 2.<sup>r</sup> De Sermone Domini in Monte, [lib. i.<sup>t</sup> De Sermone Domini in Monte, lib. i.

cap. 16. sect. 45. Op. tom. iii. part. 2. p. 185.]

cap. 27.



back to the place where I recited it<sup>u</sup>. And here he says again, it must be interpreted so, or else certainly in some such sense as does not make them holy so as to inherit the kingdom, unless they be baptized.

2. He also here recites the explication that Pelagius had given of this text, and says, ‘Pelagius when he wrote on this <sup>299.</sup> (A.D. 399.) ‘epistle, expounded it thus: “*Exempla jam præcesserant, et virorum quos uxores, et fœminarum quas mariti, lucrificerant Christo, et parvulorum ad quos faciendos Christianos voluntas Christiana etiam unius parentis evicerat*.” There were by this ‘time examples, both of men whom their wives, and of women whom ‘their husbands, had gained over to Christ; and of infants, concerning whom the Christian desire even of one of their parents had ‘prevailed that they should be made Christians.’

He manifestly paraphrases these words [‘now are they holy’] thus, ‘now are they made Christians.’ And, the unbelieving party has been sanctified, i. e. has been gained over to Christ.

The very same explication is, as they say, still extant at this text, in those Commentaries on St. Paul’s Epistles, that go under the name of St. Hierome, but are Pelagius’, only interpolated<sup>x</sup>.

3. Tertullian, speaking of the privilege that infants have by being <sup>100.</sup> of Christian parents, or of one parent such, says, ‘now are (A.D. 200.) ‘they holy, i. e. designed for holiness; for otherwise, the ‘apostle knew what our Lord had determined, *Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God*, that ‘is, he shall not be holy.’ See the place at large, chap. iv. § 6.

4. Origen also having an eye to this text in his Comment. in <sup>110.</sup> Matth. p. 332, ed. Rothom. 1668y, shews how he under- (A.D. 210.) stood *ἡγλασται* here. ‘*Ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναῖκὸς ἀμφοτέρων ἀπίστων, ὅτε μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ, πρότερον πιστεύσας τῷ χρόνῳ, σώζει τὴν γυναῖκα ὅτε δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ἀρξαμένη, ὕστερόν ποτε πείθει τὸν ἄνδρα.* ‘When a man ‘and his wife are both unbelievers; sometimes the man believing ‘first in time, saves his wife: and sometimes the wife believing first, ‘does a while after persuade her husband.’

He that so paraphrases the man *sanctified*, i. e. converted to the Christian religion, could not well understand the sanctity [or holiness] of the children otherwise than their being baptized into it.

5. Paulinus writes to St. Hierome this question, ‘How are they

<sup>u</sup> Ch. xv. sect. 2.

<sup>v</sup> [De Peccat. Meritis, &c. lib. iii. cap. 12.]

<sup>x</sup> [See these in vol. xi. p. 810, &c. of St.

Jerome’s works, by Vallarsius.]

<sup>y</sup> [Comment. tom. xiii. § 28. edit. Benedict.]



293. ' holy, whenas without the gift of the grace [viz. baptism] (A.D. 393.) ' given them afterward [after their birth] and preserved, ' they cannot be saved<sup>z</sup> ?'

6. St. Hierome for answer refers him to the forementioned resolution of Tertullian, but withal mentions some other interpretations about legal cleanness or uncleanness.

And the same father, in his epistle to Læta<sup>a</sup>, a Christian woman, daughter of Albinus a heathen, priest of Jupiter, having mentioned this text, says, it had been verified in her family ; for that she who had been born ' de impari matrimonio,' ' of an unequal marriage,' i. e. her father a heathen, but her mother being a Christian, ' the sweetness of the fruit had recompensed for the bitterness of the root ; ' and an ill shrub had sweat forth precious balsam, &c. We have ' borne [or waited] to good purpose. A holy and Christian family ' does sanctify one unbeliever. He [Albinus himself] is now a candidate of the faith, since he is encompassed with a multitude of his ' children and grandchildren that believe. I fancy that Jupiter ' himself might have believed, if he had had such kindred.' Since he makes this to be a fulfilling of this text, and the sanctifying of an unbeliever to be the converting, or probability of converting him ; it is plain he understood it as those foregoing. All these bring the baptism of infants into the explication of their holiness.

St. Chrysostom says<sup>b</sup> a great deal of clean and unclean, without coming to any particular explication of what he means by 298. (A.D. 398.) it. He says, ' that the woman might not fear being made ' unclean by the copulation, the apostle tells her, *the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife,*' &c. And then having shewn why, though adultery is a reasonable cause of separation, yet idolatry or heathenism is not, he adds, ' then there is given a proof of this : ' for on supposition that thou being unclean didst bring forth a ' child, and that child being not from thee alone, the child would be ' unclean, or but half clean ; and therefore he adds, *else were your children unclean, but now they are holy,* i. e. not unclean. But he ' uses the word *holy*, by an overreaching expression, that he might ' further dispel all fear of any such suspicion, viz. of uncleanness.'

This is something obscure : but he seems to make no more out of this text than the antipædobaptists do. Yet it is plain that he could not mean that by this cleanness the children would obtain salvation without baptism ; because he so often and so plainly affirms the contrary, as I have shewed in chap. xiv. § 2.

<sup>z</sup> See chap. xviii.

<sup>a</sup> Epist. 7. [57. in ed. Benedict.—107. ed. Vallars.]

<sup>b</sup> In loc. [Homil. xix. in 1 Cor. § 2.—Op. tom. x. p. 262.]

8. He that made the Commentaries ascribed to St. Ambrose talks yet more slightly: he says<sup>c</sup>, ‘if the believing party stay with the other, the sign of the cross will be used in the house; and that is a sanctification of it: and that, if the believing party go away, and lie with others, it would be adultery; and the children so begotten would be unclean, because they would be bastards.’ He makes St. Paul’s arguing to come to no more than this; let the believing woman stay and sanctify the house and her unbelieving husband with the sign of the cross; for if she go from him, and lie with others, the children so begotten would be bastards. Who doubts it?

I know not at what year to place this author; for these Commentaries are pieced out of several authors, some elder, some later. This I believe was a later one.

9. Theodoret explains<sup>d</sup>, ‘the unbelieving party is sanctified, that <sup>323.</sup> is, there is hope of their salvation. But, suppose either (A.D. 423.) ‘the man or the woman do persist in unbelief; yet the seed shall be saved.’ These last words he explains as Calvin has since done.

10. He that wrote the *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, that are among the works of Athanasius, explains *holy* by ‘shall be saved.’ But he limits it expressly to such as are baptized. I give his words among the spurious pieces, chap. xxiii. § 3.

These are all the interpretations of this text, that I know of, given by the ancients.

St. Austin in this booke answers one more objection of Pelagius, which is this; if the soul be not derived from the parents, but the body only; how comes the soul to be involved in the guilt of original sin?

He answers, 1. that Pelagius had spoke like a circumspect man, when he put that with an *if*: for that it is an obscure matter, and not to be resolved from scripture, whether the soul be derived, or be immediately created. And, 2. he bids him answer this question first, ‘If the soul be not derived, what justice is it that a soul newly created, and void of all guilt, wholly free from all contagion of sin, should in infants suffer several passions and torturings of the body, and, which is more dreadful, the outrage of evil spirits?’ He advises, that since we see this by experience to be so, and yet cannot answer for the reason or justice of it, we should in all such questions remember that we are but men.

<sup>c</sup> In loc. [Append. ad Op. Ambrosii, tom. ii. p. 134.]

<sup>d</sup> In loc. [Op. tom. iii. p. 151. ed. Paris. 1642. <sup>e</sup> De Peccatorum Meritis, lib. iii. cap. 10.]

Having made so large an abstract of what St. Austin says of this matter in these three books, which were his first work against the Pelagians; I may have liberty to pass by a great many sayings in his following books against them. For it were endless to recite all the passages which we meet with in them speaking of infant-baptism, and proving from it original sin. I shall therefore mention only here and there one, and that only in English, for brevity.

XX. The next year, anno 413, St. Hierome wrote his epistle to <sup>313.</sup> Ctesiphon<sup>f</sup>, against that opinion of the Pelagians, which (A.D. 413.) denies the need we have of God's grace; wherein he mentions not Pelagius by name, but means him when he says, 'speak out that which you hold: declare publicly what you talk in private to your disciples.—This is the only heresy that is ashamed to speak openly what it teaches privately. The forwardness of the disciples publishes that which the masters keep in. What they hear in the chambers they proclaim on the housetop.' He instances in some passages of a book published by one of the disciples: which was probably Cælestius; for Pelagius being of more refined politics, generally forbore to appear himself, and put this Irishman foremost. They called the book Syllogisms; but St. Hierome says it ought to be called *Solæcisms*. It had in it such sayings as these:

'It is in vain that God has given me the power of freewill, if I cannot put it in practice without his continual help.'

'I do either use the power once given me, so as that freewill is preserved: or else, if I stand in need of another's help, the freedom of will is destroyed in me.'

'If I have a mind to bend my finger, stir my hand, sit, stand, walk, run, spit, blow my nose, ease myself, make water: what! shall the help of God be always necessary for me?'

This St. Hierome calls blasphemy and sacrilege; and says,

'What venom of heretics does not this surpass? They maintain that by reason of the freedom of their will they have no further need of God.'

He has nothing here of original sin, and so not of infants. He <sup>314.</sup> promised a larger work, in which he would refute all their (A.D. 414.) errors; which he performed two years after.

The next year St. Austin wrote a large and elaborate letter in answer to one he had received out of Sicily from Hilarius. It is to be noted that Cælestius, after his being condemned in Africa, or else in going from Rome to Africa, had made his abode for some time in

<sup>f</sup> Epist. 120. [133. edit. Vallars.]



Sicily; and had, as it seems, sowed the seeds of his heresy there. For Hilarius desired St. Austin's judgment concerning some new doctrine, 'which,' says he, 'some Christians at Syracuse do 'publish.'

1. 'That a man may be without sin, and keep God's commandments easily, if he will.

2. 'That an unbaptized infant surprised with death cannot perish deservedly, because he is born without sin.

3. 'That a rich man, if he keep his wealth, and do not sell all that he has, cannot enter into the kingdom of God. And that it will not avail him that he uses his riches well [or according to the commandments].

4. 'That one must not swear at all.

5. 'Whether the church, of which it is written, not having spot or wrinkle, be that in which we now live, or that which we hope for. For some think it is this church which consists of present persons,' &c.

To the second of these St. Austin answers<sup>h</sup>,

'Whereas they say, "An unbaptized infant cannot perish because he is born without sin." The apostle does not say so: and I suppose it is better to believe the apostle than them. For that teacher of the Gentiles, in whom Christ speaks, says, *By one man sin entered into the world, &c. For judgment was by one (offence) to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification*<sup>i</sup>. Therefore if they can find any infant that is not sprung from the concupiscence of that one man; of such an one let them say, that he is not liable to that condemnation, nor needs by the grace of Christ to be delivered from it.'

'What means, *By one offence to condemnation*, but, by that one offence in which Adam offended? And what means, *Of many offences to justification*; but that the grace of Christ does take off, not only that offence with which infants, sprung from that one man, are held bound; but also the many offences which, when they are grown men, they add to it by wicked practices? But still that one, to which the carnal offspring that derives from that first man is liable, is, he says, enough for their condemnation. Therefore the baptism of infants is no more than what is necessary: that they, who by their generation are subject to that condemnation, may by regeneration be freed from it. And as there is not

<sup>g</sup> Inter Epistolas Augustini, Ep. 88. [156, ed. Benedict. tom. ii. p. 542.]

<sup>h</sup> Epist. 89. [157, ed. Benedict.]

<sup>i</sup> Rom. v. 12, &c.



‘ a person in the world who is carnally generated but from Adam ;  
 ‘ so neither is any spiritually regenerated but by Christ. The carnal  
 ‘ generation is liable to that one offence, and the condemnation  
 ‘ thereof: but the spiritual regeneration takes away not only that  
 ‘ one for which infants are baptized; but also those many which  
 ‘ men by wicked living have added to that in which they are gene-  
 ‘ rated.

‘ And therefore he goes on, and says, *If by one man’s offence death*  
*reigned by one ; much more they which receive the abundance of grace*  
*&c. shall reign &c.* Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came  
 ‘ upon all men to condemnation ; even so by the righteousness of one the  
 ‘ free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one  
 ‘ man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one  
 ‘ shall many be made righteous. [Cap. iii. § 11.]

‘ What will they say to this ? Or what is possible for them to say,  
 ‘ unless they will plead that the apostle is mistaken ? that chosen  
 ‘ vessel, the teacher of the Gentiles, that trumpet of Christ, pro-  
 ‘ claims, *Judgment came by one to condemnation* : and these proclaim  
 ‘ on the contrary ; and say, that infants, who, as they confess, derive  
 ‘ from that one man of whom he speaks, do not go into con-  
 ‘ demnation, though they be not baptized.’

‘ *Judgment*, says he, *came by one to condemnation*. By one, what  
 ‘ does he mean, but by one offence ? Since it follows, *But the grace*  
 ‘ *is of many offences to justification*.’

Then he answers to that plea of theirs, by which they said that  
 St. Paul by *one offence* meant both the sin of Adam, and also all the  
 sins which men by imitating that do commit.

He shews, that if St. Paul had meant so, he would have said in  
 like manner of the grace of Christ, that that was of one offence to  
 justification : but he distinguishes, and says, condemnation came by  
*one offence* ; but the grace of Christ justifies from *many* offences.  
 [§ 20.]

Afterwards he says, ‘ If as they pretend, the apostle had said these  
 ‘ things on this account, that we should understand sinners to be-  
 ‘ long to that first man, not that we derive sin by being born of him,  
 ‘ but by imitating him : he would rather have named the Devil ;  
 ‘ for he sinned first, and from him mankind do not derive their  
 ‘ pedigree, but only they imitate him.—And if it were on account  
 ‘ of imitation that the apostle named the first man, because he was  
 ‘ the first sinner among men, and for that reason all sinful men were  
 ‘ said to belong to him : why did he not name Abel as the second  
 ‘ man, who was the first righteous among men ?——But he names

‘ Adam, and on the other part names none but Christ. Because as  
 ‘ the one, a man, did by his sin defile his posterity ; so the other,  
 ‘ God and man, did by his righteousness save his inheritance : the  
 ‘ one by transferring [or conveying] the defilement of the flesh,  
 ‘ which the Devil, though wicked, could not ; the other by giving  
 ‘ the grace of his Spirit, which Abel, though righteous, could not.’  
 [§ 21.]

He at last observes to Hilarius, that Cælestius had been condemned for this doctrine at Carthage two years before : and tells him that he himself had published some books, and had preached oftentimes against it, and had recovered several. That there were still some at Carthage that held that opinion ; but privately : that in many places there were more of them than one would expect. ‘ And where they are not refuted, they seduce others to their sect ; and are grown so numerous, that I know not what it will come to. But we wish rather that they should be healed in the unity of the church, than that they should be cut off from the body of it as incurable members ; provided necessity do not compel it. For there is some fear lest more limbs do putrify, whilst the putrified ones are spared,’ &c. [§ 22.]

XXI. The third and fourth positions of the Pelagians, about a rich man, and about swearing, are such as may possibly raise the reader’s curiosity to know what was said to those questions in these times.

To the third St. Austin observes, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were rich, and continued so ; and yet have a place in the kingdom. That the rich man in the parable did not go into torment because he died rich ; but because he was luxurious, and unmerciful to Lazarus : that Lazarus, when he died, was carried into the bosom of a rich man, &c. [§ 23.]

And whereas the Pelagians pretended that the selling of all is necessary under the New Testament, though not under the Old ; he observes that our Saviour, who set the rich young man this condition of being perfect ; *sell that thou hast*, &c., yet did not set this as the condition of entering into life : but that other, *keep the commandments*<sup>k</sup>. That the apostle, teaching rich men how to *lay hold on eternal life*<sup>l</sup>, bids them *do good, distribute, communicate*, &c., but does not require them to sell all. [§ 24–26.]

But to the argument which they raised from these words of our Saviour, *A rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven*<sup>m</sup>, &c., St. Austin makes no answer but what seems defective. ‘ How

<sup>k</sup> Matt. xix. 17, 21.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18, 19.

<sup>m</sup> Matt. xix. 23, &c.

‘is it then,’ says he; ‘does the apostle speak contrary to the Lord? or do these men not understand what they talk of?’ He refers them to Christ’s following words, *With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.* Those they explained thus, as he tells us; ‘Christ knew that several rich men, upon hearing the gospel, would sell their estates and give them to the poor, &c., and so that would be done which seemed so difficult: not that any of them continuing in their wealth, would, by keeping those rules of the apostle, lay hold on eternal life: but that selling all that they had, they would so fulfil those rules of the apostle.’ [§ 28.]

Here St. Austin observes, that according to this their own interpretation, ‘our Lord does, contrary to their tenet, set forth his own grace; for he does not say, “that which seems to you impossible, is easy for men to do, if they will.” But he says, *that which is impossible with men, is easy with God.*’ And following on that point, he forgets to return and give any answer how he himself would have those words of our Saviour to be understood. Only he observes that the apostle’s words could not be so meant as they explained them, viz. of selling all they had: because he gives several rules how they should provide for their servants, children, &c., which is not consistent with selling all they had: ‘For,’ as he observes, ‘how can this be done without a house, and something to keep it?’ [§ 29. *et seqq.*]

Our Saviour seems in that saying, *a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of God*, to have meant, as he does in many other places, by *the kingdom of heaven*, and *the kingdom of God*, not the kingdom of glory, but the state of the profession of the gospel, and of faith in him, as it was at that time, when both himself and all that would be his disciples, were so persecuted, that they could not think of keeping any estate if they had it. And as things so stood, it was very hard to persuade any rich man to enter into it; so hard, that humanly speaking, it was impossible. Only God by the power of his grace might overcome that love of their wealth, which hindered them from owning Christ. Now that difficulty is not at all times; but only in times of persecution.

If this be the sense; the translation would be more intelligible if it were said, not ‘shall hardly,’ but ‘will hardly enter,’ &c.

And if this be the sense; then what St. Austin answers is pertinent and full: viz. that there are many rich men, who, though they do not actually sell all, and give to the poor, yet are ready to part with all, if occasion should be, for the sake of Christ and his truth; and who in the meantime do keep their families in Christian disci-



pline, use hospitality and beneficence to the poor, receive a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, &c. And he takes notice that Pelagius himself was relieved in his necessities by such rich men, and entertained by them; (and others speak of him as a great haunter of such men's houses :) he says,

‘ These men, if they expect to be such as the apostle speaks of, *that shall judge angels*, ought to resolve beforehand to receive into *everlasting habitations those that have made them their friends with the mammon of unrighteousness*.——Those servants of God, who having sold all, do afterwards live upon the honest labour of their own hands, may with much less impudence condemn men from whom they receive nothing; than those that not being able by reason of some infirmity to work with their hands, do condemn the men that maintain them.’ [§ 37, 38.]

‘ I that write this, was greatly in love with that perfection of which our Lord spoke, when he said to the rich man, *Go and sell all, &c.*, and I did so; not by my own strength, but by his assisting grace. And though I was not rich; there will never the less be imputed to me for that: for the apostles themselves, that did this first, were no rich men. But he parts with all the world that parts with all that he has or hopes to have.——And I do my utmost endeavour to persuade others to this purpose; and I have in the name of God several partners, who have by my ministry been brought to it. But still so, as that the sound doctrine is preserved among us; and that we do not in way of vainglory censure those that do not take the same course; and tell them that it will not avail them to live chastely in matrimony, to order their houses and families Christian like,’ &c. [§ 39.]

I think this to be a modest and handsome rebuke of the pride of those two monks; who valued themselves so much upon their selling their temporal possessions, that they censured all that did not do the like, as incapable of God's kingdom. St. Austin shews that he and several others had done the same, with less noise and less spiritual pride and censure.

To the fourth, about swearing, he says thus: ‘ Avoid swearing as much as is possible: for it is better not to swear even to the truth, than by a custom of swearing to fall often into perjury, and always to come in danger of it. But these men, as far as appears by what I have heard some of them talk, do not know what is swearing; for they think they do not swear when they say, “God knows,” or “God is witness,” or, “I call God to witness upon my soul;”



‘because it is not said “By God:” and because such phrases as the forementioned are found in the apostle Paul. But even that phrase which they confess to be swearing is found in him, when he says, *by your rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord*<sup>a</sup>. For in the Greek this plainly appears to be swearing: so that one cannot take those words in the Latin, *per vestram gloriam*, “by your rejoicing,” as those, *per meum adventum iterum ad vos*<sup>b</sup>, “by my coming to you again,” and many such like, where it is said, “by any thing,” and yet there is no swearing, are to be taken.’

‘But because the apostle, a man most strong in the truth, swore in his epistles, we must not therefore make a sport of swearing. As for us, it is much safer, as I said, never to swear; but to make use of Yes, yes; and No, no; as our Lord advises: not that it is a sin to swear truly; but it is a most dreadful sin to swear falsely: into which he naturally falls that accustoms himself to swear.’  
[§ 40.]

This is St. Austin’s sense: and whereas some of the ancients Fathers are against all swearing; there was a particular reason in their time: because all the oaths then administered in courts were by the heathen gods, or the genii of the emperors.

The instance that he gives of St. Paul’s swearing is the plainest in the scripture: for whereas the Latin language uses the word *per*, as the English the word *by*, to many other purposes, as well as swearing; the Greek, as St. Austin observes, has a peculiar word *νῆ* for *by*, in the case of swearing by any thing, and which is never used but in swearing: as *νῆ Δία*, and *νῆ τοὺς Θεοὺς*. And so *νῆ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν*, is, without any more addition, ‘I swear [for which our English have put I protest] by your glory, [or rejoicing,] which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord,’ i. e. by that which is our common Christian hope and joy.

XXII. There came the same year some more questions out of Sicily for St. Austin to resolve, from Eutropius and Paulus. They sent him a paper, entitled, *Definitiones, ut dicitur, Cælestii*, ‘Arguments given out, as is said, by Cælestius.’

It contained fourteen arguments, or rather one argument diversified in words fourteen times; to prove that a man may be without sin if he will. That argument is no other than this dilemma, ‘God’s commands are either possible or impossible,’ &c.

It might be worth the while of a young sophister to read them for a pattern to see how many ways that fallacy may be varied; as, ‘Sin is either a thing that may be avoided, or that cannot be

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. v. 31.

<sup>b</sup> Philipp. i. 26.

‘avoided,’ &c., ‘Sin is either a thing of will or of necessity,’ &c. but they are not worth reciting here. St. Austin recites them, and gives particular answers to each of them<sup>c</sup>: that a man may by God’s grace have in general a will, desire, and aim to avoid all sin: but by reason of our frailty, no man finds that purpose to hold out so steady in all particulars but that he often slips, and sometimes falls. Neither does it do us any good to prove how unblamable we should be on supposition that our will were faultless: since our greatest blemish is the corrupt inclination of our will itself, which complies with the tentations, in all men at some times and to some degree; but in men destitute of God’s grace, so far as to yield the dominion to sin. And since this is too plain by experience, what do sophisms to the contrary avail us? Our business is to get cure by God’s grace for this distemper, not to dispute ourselves out of the sense of it.

About this time Pelagius wrote one of his most elaborate pieces, <sup>314.</sup> entitled, ‘Of the Abilities of Nature.’ To which St. Au-  
 (A. D. 414.) <sup>315.</sup> stin, next year, wrote an answer, entitled, ‘Of Nature and  
 (A. D. 415.) ‘Grace<sup>d</sup>.’ He owns<sup>e</sup> that Pelagius had shewn an example of a most strong and nimble wit, and had well reproved those that excuse their wickedness by laying all the fault of it on the nature of man: but that he had carried this zeal too far, in saying that men that are wicked might have been sinless if they would; and, that ‘if they were sinners because they could not be otherwise, they are not to be blamed.’ On which St. Austin makes this remark<sup>f</sup>, ‘Mind what he says: Now I say that an infant born and surprised with death in such a place where he cannot be relieved by the baptism of Christ, is as he is, (viz. dies without the washing of regeneration,) because he could be no otherwise. Let him then absolve such an one, and set open the kingdom of heaven to him, in spite of our Lord’s declaration,’ &c.

Among several arguments as good as the case would bear, Pelagius there uses one very silly logical quirk. In opposition to what the church held of our nature in the state in which it now is, viz. that it is depraved and weakened by sin, he said<sup>g</sup>, ‘What is sin? Is it any substantial thing; or a name without any substance, by which is meant not any real thing, not any existence, not any bodily thing; but the act of something done amiss? And how can that which has no substance weaken or change human nature?’

St. Austin produces the instance of some godly man, crying out,

<sup>c</sup> Lib. de Perfectione Justitiæ Hominis, ad Eutropium. [Op. tom. x. p. 167, &c.]

<sup>d</sup> [Op. tom. x. p. 127, &c.]

<sup>e</sup> Cap. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. 7.

<sup>g</sup> Apud Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, cap. 19.

as it is, Ps. xli. 4, *Lord, be merciful to me, heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee, &c.* He bids Pelagius ask such a man, ‘What he ails? What is sin, is it a substance,’ &c.? How can a thing ‘that has no substance defile thy soul,’ &c.? And then adds, ‘Would not the man, in the bitterness of his soul, bid him begone,’ &c.? ‘You see whither this argument tends, and to what it would lead us; to think those words spoken to no purpose; *Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.* For how shall he save them if they have no ailing? Sins, from which the gospel says Christ’s people are to be saved, are no substances, and so cannot defile. Oh, brother, it were a good thing if you would remember that you are a Christian<sup>h</sup>!’

XXIII. Pelagius proved that men may be without sin, by instancing<sup>i</sup> in a great many persons who had been so, as he pretended: Abel, Enoch, Melchizedek, and twenty more: and in some women; Deborah, Anna, Judith, &c., and also the mother of our Lord and Saviour; concerning whom he said, ‘That it is necessary for our religion that we do confess her to be without sin.’

St. Austin answers, ‘Excepting the holy Virgin Mary, concerning whom I am not willing, for the honour of our Lord, to hold any dispute at all when we are talking about sin, (*Unde enim scimus quid ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum, quæ concipere ac parere meruit [eum], quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum? Hac ergo virgine excepta &c.*) For how do we know what more grace was bestowed on her to overcome all sin, who had the honour to conceive and bring forth him who certainly had no sin? But (this Virgin excepted) if we could have called together all those holy men and women when they were alive, and have asked them whether they were without sin; what do you think they would have said? As this man says, or as the apostle John says?——They would all have cried out with one voice, *If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves,*’ &c.

From what the papists nowadays say and practise in reference to the blessed Virgin, one would think that all antiquity had believed her to be sinless: but by examining we shall find that Pelagius here is the first that ever said that she was without sin. St. Austin indeed makes a very modest answer; as thinking it decent for us, in regard to the honour of our Saviour, not to hold any talk about the sins of his mother: but as one may guess by this place, and more plainly by some other, he was far from affirming her to be sinless. He often speaks positively of all mankind as sinful, excepting

<sup>h</sup> [Cap. 20.]

<sup>i</sup> Apud Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, cap. 36.



only our Saviour Christ. And for other Fathers, they make no scruple, when it comes in their way, to speak particularly of her failings: as Chrysostom on John ii. 3. And St. Hierome having repeated her Canticum, bids Pelagius mark, that ‘she does not call ‘herself blessed for any merit or virtue of her own; but by the ‘mercy of God, who vouchsafed to inhabit in heri.’

Aquinas having produced, by way of objection against himself, several reasons and some authorities, that she had sink, answers them all with that text, Cant. iv. 7, *Thou art all fair, my love, there is no spot in thee*; and with this passage of St. Austin. Now this is not to his purpose as it stands here: but in Aquinas’ citation the words are altered. He reads them thus, ‘Inde enim scimus quod ei ‘plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum ex omni parte peccatum, ‘quod concipere,’ &c. ‘For we know that more grace was bestowed ‘on her to overcome all sin, by this; that she had the honour to ‘conceive [or, deserved to conceive,]’ &c. But the Jesuit Vasquez had something more of honesty: for though he would have the words read as Aquinas reads them; yet he confesses that he found them in the book as I have transcribed them. He quotes ‘Unde ‘enim,’ but adds as of his own, ‘or rather *inde enim*.’ and he quotes ‘quid ei plus gratiæ;’ but says, as of his own head, ‘or rather, *quod ‘ei plus gratiæ*!’ And the word *quæ* he does not pretend to alter into *quod* at all.

The edition that Vasquez had was more unexceptionable, and gives even less occasion to the popish alterations, than that out of which I transcribe, which is Erasmus’, printed at Venice, 1551, (and his editions are commonly the least tainted with their corruptions of the text); for Vasquez reads *quid*, which, together with the sense of the discourse there, justifies my alteration. If there were not some eye kept over these men, they would, both in the Fathers, and in the scripture too, alter the words, as some of them have done here, to serve their turn.

They had better take Pelagius’ words, which serve their purpose without any alteration: it would not be the first time they have borrowed from some heretic a doctrine which was never owned in the ancient catholic church. Pelagius does not only say she was sinless, but makes it a necessary point of religion to believe so; which fits them to a hair.

XXIV. Pelagius lived all this while at Jerusalem: but what he

j Dialog. i. [contra Pelagianos, § 16. Op. ii. p. 698.]

k Thomæ Aquinatis Summa Theologica;

pars tertia, quæstio 27. art. 3. 4.

l Comment. in tertiam partem Summæ Thomæ: tom. ii. Disp. 117. cap. 3.



wrote was in Latin; so that his opinions were more talked of in the west, where he had lived, and where that language was understood and spoken, than in the east, where he now was; because little but Greek was read or spoken there.

He could not have found a more convenient retreat than at Jerusalem: for John the bishop there, with whom he lived, was himself addicted to new opinions. Both Epiphanius and St. Hierome had a good while before wrote against him for holding several of the condemned opinions of Origen; to which some of Pelagius' tenets were pretty near akin.

About this time there happened a meeting of bishops at Jerusalem: and Orosius, a young man, who had been with St. Austin, and was now at Bethlehem with St. Hierome, came to this meeting; and declared to them what a noise there was in the west, about some doctrines published by Cælestius, and countenanced by some writings of Pelagius, and that St. Austin had wrote against them. And he caused to be read<sup>m</sup> to them (as well as could be done by an <sup>315.</sup> interpreter) St. Austin's letter to Hilarius, mentioned before in § 20, 21<sup>n</sup>. Pelagius being asked whether he had taught those doctrines, against which St. Austin there writes; answered, 'Who is that Austin?' [or, What is Austin to me<sup>o</sup>?] Some in the council answered, 'He that speaks against that bishop by whose means God has restored unity to all Africa, deserves to be turned out, not only from this assembly, but from the whole church.'

They referred to the service St. Austin had done in reducing the Donatists.

But bishop John, who presided, interposed for him: and all that was urged against him at that time being this, that he had maintained that a man might live without sin; John said, 'If he had maintained this to be possible without God's help, it were a thing to be condemned; but since he adds that, what have you to say? Do you deny God's help?' So a squabble arising, and Orosius, who could speak no Greek, as they no Latin, not being able to make them understand the fallacy which Pelagius concealed under that word, 'God's help;' the issue was, that the matter should be referred to Innocent, bishop of Rome, and that in the mean time Pelagius should keep silence: and so nothing at this meeting was said about original sin. And John the bishop took occasion quickly after to

<sup>m</sup> Pauli Orosii Apologetic. [contra Pelagium, de Arbitrii libertate; sub init. p. 590. edit. Haverkamp, Lugd. Bat. 1738.]

<sup>n</sup> [See above, p. 243.]

<sup>o</sup> [The words, as quoted by Orosius, are, 'et quis est mihi Augustinus?']

fall out with Orosius: upon which he wrote his Apologetic, which is still extant, and out of which some quotations to our purpose about infant-baptism might be taken; but they have nothing different from what St. Austin, and St. Hierome, and Pelagius himself, have: and therefore I shall for brevity omit them.

But about the latter end of this year 415, there was another <sup>315.</sup> assembly of fourteen bishops in this country, at the town (A.D. 415.) which in scripture is called Lydda, but was then called Diospolis, to which Pelagius was summoned. And there he could come off no other way but by denying several of his opinions, which he had promoted before; and which (as St. Austin makes appear) he for all this denial continued to promote afterward.

The articles objected to him were taken, partly out of some books of his own; partly out of some books of Cælestius, who was looked on as his scholar; and partly out of the acts of a council at Carthage, where Cælestius had been condemned; and partly out of that catalogue of new opinions which Hilarius had sent to St. Austin out of Sicily, and which St. Austin refuted in the forementioned letter.

Of what was cited from his own books, he denied part; and said the book was not writ by him, though it went under his name. The rest he defended, and put as fair a colour on as he could; which was easy to do, because what he had wrote in Latin, (which these bishops did not understand,) he explained to them in Greek: (for he did not speak to them by an interpreter, as Mr. Le Clerc mistakes the matter:) and because his accusers were not there, being sick; but only their libel was read.

But he himself had been wary in his expressions, for what Cælestius had. Of the articles taken from the books or words of Cælestius he defended some; as, 'The possibility of avoiding all sin, by God's help,' &c., but renounced the rest, in these words; 'The other things, as they confess themselves, were not spoken by me; and so I have no reason to answer for them. Yet, for the satisfaction of the holy synod, I do renounce [anathematize] all that do hold so.' So he got off with a whole skin; but left several of his beloved opinions behind him condemned, as appears by minding which those were that he renounced.

The account of the whole is long; especially of those articles which bore a dispute in what sense he had spoke or understood them. What is most material to give us the sense of the church at that time, is, to recite those which the council condemned, and he was forced to condemn: which you have in the words of St. Austin,

in his letter to Paulinus<sup>r</sup>, expressed much shorter than in the book *De Gestis Palæst.*, (where the acts of this council are at large recited,) but to the same effect. He writes thus :

‘ For beside those articles which he ventured to defend as well as ‘ he could ; some things were objected to him, which unless he had ‘ renounced [anathematized] he would have been renounced himself.

‘ For it was objected, that he said [or held,]

1. ‘ That Adam, whether he had sinned or not, would have died.

2. ‘ That his sin hurt himself only, and not mankind.

3. ‘ That infants new born are in the same state that Adam was ‘ before his fall.

4. ‘ That neither by the death or fall of Adam does all mankind ‘ die, nor by the resurrection of Christ does all mankind arise.’

These, you see, are the same that had been objected to Cælestius<sup>s</sup> four years before.

5. ‘ That infants, though they be not baptized, have eternal life.

6. ‘ That rich men, unless they part with all, &c., cannot have the ‘ kingdom of God.’

These two were taken out of the heads of new doctrine broached at Syracuse<sup>t</sup>.

7. ‘ That the grace of God is not given in every action ; but is in ‘ freewill ; or, in the law and doctrine.’

And several other articles about grace and merit.

‘ All these Pelagius did so renounce [anathematizavit] as the ‘ acts of the council do shew, that he did not produce any thing in ‘ defence of them. From whence it follows, that whosoever will own ‘ the authority of that episcopal judgment, and the confession of ‘ Pelagius himself, must hold these things, (which the catholic ‘ church has ever held,) viz.

‘ That Adam, if he had not sinned, would not have died.

‘ That his sin hurt, not himself only, but mankind.

‘ That infants new born are not in the state that Adam was ‘ before his fall, &c.

‘ That unbaptized infants will miss, not only of the kingdom of ‘ heaven, but also of eternal life,’ &c.

Though this must needs have cost Pelagius a sore pang ; yet so it happened, that the news of his being acquitted in this council made more noise among the vulgar people to his advantage, than his being compelled to renounce those opinions did against his cause : especially in the west, where they heard he was acquitted

<sup>r</sup> Epist. 106. [186. cap. 9. § 32, 33. ed. Benedict.]

<sup>s</sup> See above, § 5.

<sup>t</sup> See above, § 20.



and approved; but did not hear upon what terms. He himself also published accounts of the matter to his own advantage<sup>u</sup>, and triumphed of his success. So that the Pelagians were never more uppish, than they were for a while after this synod.

And yet, upon the whole matter, though St. Austin does often speak of these bishops, as having been imposed on by Pelagius in matter of fact; and do shew how he disguised and concealed his true meaning from them; and though he do, in a letter, which he a little while after this wrote to John bishop of Jerusalem, desiring him to send a copy of the acts of the council, say thus, ‘As for Pelagius, our brother and your son, whom I hear you love very well; I advise you so to manage your love to him, that they that know him, and have attentively heard him, may not judge your holiness to be imposed on by him, &c. For when you hear him confess the grace and help of God, you think he means the same that you do, who have a catholic sense of it, because you do not know what he has wrote in his book; and for that reason I have sent you his book, and mine written in answer to it<sup>x</sup>.’ And though St. Hierome do on this account call this synod, ‘the pitiful synod of Diospolis<sup>y</sup>’; yet, I say, upon the whole matter, it appears by the acts of this council, that these bishops, though, as St. Austin says, ‘they could not thoroughly examine the man; yet for the heresy itself, they gave it a deadly wound<sup>z</sup>.’ For by forcing Pelagius to declare what he did, about the sin of Adam, the natural state of infants, and the necessity of God’s grace, and the renouncing of merit, they shewed that they were far enough from Pelagianism: so that St. Austin says, that when he read the acts of this council, and before he saw Pelagius’ books of freewill, wherein he returned to his vomit again; he thought ‘that this question had been at an end; and that Pelagius had plainly owned original sin in infants<sup>a</sup>.’

XXV. This I note the rather, because some among us nowadays, that shew a good-will to Pelagianism, and do strangely shuffle with that ninth Article of the church of England, which is of original sin, expounding it all away, do shelter themselves under the pretended authority of the Greek church, as if the Greek Fathers had not owned that doctrine. Whereas not only this council that acquitted Pelagius, yet condemned the opinions laid to his charge; but also the other councils of the eastern nations agreed with the Latins in

<sup>u</sup> Aug. de Gestis Pelagii Palæstin. cap. 30.

<sup>x</sup> Epist. 252. [179. § 1—5. ed. Benedict.]

<sup>y</sup> Hieronym. Epist. 79. [143. ed. Valars.]

<sup>z</sup> De Gestis Pal. cap. 21.

<sup>a</sup> Lib. ii. de Peccato Origin. cap. 14.



condemning the said doctrines; and the men too, when it appeared that they really held such doctrines.

For three years after this, Theodotus bishop of Antioch held a  
<sup>318.</sup> synod at Jerusalem, to which Pelagius was cited, and there  
 (A.D. 418.) condemned; as is recorded by Marius Mercator *Commonitor.* cap. 3.

And sometime after, Julian the Pelagian, with seventeen more of his party, wrote to the bishop of Thessalonica, representing their own doctrine in the fairest colours, and that of the catholics in the west in the blackest; hoping to make a party in the Greek church<sup>b</sup>: but found none, or hardly any, that they could bring over.

Cælestius, before his condemnation at Rome, went to Constantinople, to try if any interest could be made there. But Atticus, the bishop there, would neither receive him nor his doctrine<sup>c</sup>. St. Austin mentions this in short, lib. iii, *Contra Julian.* cap. 1. But Mercator more at large, *Commonitor.* cap. 1. ‘Some years after he went to Constantinople, in the time of Atticus of holy memory; where being discovered to hold such opinions, he was by the great care of that holy man driven from that city: and letters were sent concerning him into Asia, to Thessalonica and Carthage, to the bishops there; of which I have copies ready to be produced. But the said Cælestius being driven from hence also went to Rome,’ &c.

At Ephesus also they were rejected and disowned, ‘not suffered to abide there;’ which is the word of Prosper, who relates this, *lib. de Ingratis*, cap. 2. But Mr. Le Clerc expresses it, ‘ill treated.’

The only hopeful attempt they ever made in the Greek church  
<sup>331.</sup> was about fifteen years after this time: when a general  
 (A.D. 431.) council being called to Ephesus on account of Nestorius, (who had innovated in the doctrine of the incarnation,) they joined their party with his, as is usual for discontented parties to do; and made in all at first forty-three, but quickly dwindled to thirty, as appears by the address of the council to the emperor; where they say, ‘It is an absurd thing that thirty men only (some of whom had been a good while ago deposed, some are of the false opinion of Cælestius, &c.) should set themselves against a synod of 210 bishops, with whom all the western bishops (and so the whole world) do consent.’ They made also canons<sup>d</sup>, ‘that if any clergyman did publicly or privately promote the opinions of Nestorius or Cælestius, they should be deprived.’

<sup>b</sup> August. ad Bonifac. contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum, cap. i. § 3.

<sup>c</sup> Acta concilii Ephesini, part. i. cap. 18.

[Labb. iii. p. 353. Mansi, iv. p. 1025.]

<sup>d</sup> Can. 4. [apud Labb. iii. p. 805. Mansi, iv. 1473.]

These things, and more to the same purpose, are largely and particularly quoted out of the acts of that council, by bishop Ussher, in the forementioned treatise<sup>e</sup>. So that it is hard to guess what these men get by appealing to the Greek church.

And for the Greek Fathers before this time; Vossius has largely shewn in his Pelagian history<sup>f</sup>, that they commonly teach the doctrine of original sin. Only he thinks Clemens Alexandrinus must be excepted: but Dr. Hammond shews<sup>g</sup> that there is no reason for that exception. Vossius is of opinion that there is no difference between St. Austin and the ancient Greek Fathers about that other point, of predestination; but that<sup>h</sup> what the ancients Fathers omitted concerning predestination, he adds. But, allowing that to be a matter in which men will always pass various judgments, and will find each their own sentiments both in the scripture and the Fathers; it cannot with any modesty at all be pretended that they do not own and complain of original sin, or natural corruption. It is true, that most of them were of opinion that this corruption or sin should in unbaptized infants be punished no otherwise than by the loss of the kingdom of heaven. And in this indeed they differed from most of the Latins.

Mr. Le Clerc says<sup>i</sup>, 'they that have so ill an opinion of Pelagius, as St. Austin had, do say, that if St. Austin had been able to read the Greek doctors, he would have found that they speak no otherwise than Pelagius does; as may,' says he, 'be seen in a great many places in St. Chrysostom, and in Isidore of Pelusium, whom some moderns have openly accused of Pelagianism.'

By singling out St. Chrysostom, he follows the steps of the old Pelagians; for it appears out of St. Austin's books against Julian the Pelagian, lib. i, and lib. iii, that he and Anianus do make their chief boast of St. Chrysostom, and do fetch more for their purpose out of him than out of any other Greek writer. They translated some of his orations that were most for their turn: and St. Austin, though not very conversant indeed in the Greek language, yet shewed that he could read and tolerably understand it, by giving instances wherein they had made them more for their purpose than they were, by their translation, as I recited before in chap. xiv. And besides, he answered them by producing other places of his, where he plainly owns original sin.

<sup>e</sup> See above, cap. 11.

<sup>f</sup> [*Historiæ de controversiis quas Pelagius ejusque reliquæ moverunt libri vii.* published separately more than once, and in the sixth volume of his col-

lected works, fol. Amst. 1701.]

<sup>g</sup> Annot. on Psalm 51.

<sup>h</sup> *De Historicis Latinis*, lib. ii. cap. 1.

<sup>i</sup> *Bibl. Univers.* tom. viii. p. 192.

And for other Greek doctors, who were more to be regarded, (for St. Chrysostom was no ancients than St. Austin himself,) he shews the doctrine of Irenæus, St. Basil, St. Gregory, &c., to have been clear and full in this matter: and says<sup>k</sup>, though he had a translation of the sermon of St. Basil, which he quoted, yet ‘he chose rather to translate it himself word for word out of the Greek, that it might be more exact.’ The like he does in the same book with two passages of St. Chrysostom, setting down the Greek words. So that the foresaid censure, passed on him, has more in it of the assuming humour of a critic, than it has of truth or good manners.

And to expect of St. Austin that he should have read Isidore, to know the sense of the Greek church, is (if one consider the age of each) a jest indeed.

I gave some instances above, in chap. xiv, where both St. Chrysostom, and this Isidore, and also Theodoret, (for they all run in one vein, and the two latter shew a great ambition to imitate the former,) have expressions something like those of Pelagius about infant-baptism, viz. ‘that infants are baptized though they have no <sup>315.</sup> ‘sins:’ where yet it appears by circumstances that their (A D. 415.) meaning was only that they had no actual ones.

XXVI. About the same time that the synod of Diospolis was held, St. Hierome published his three books against the opinions of Pelagius<sup>m</sup>, (not naming him, but sufficiently decyphering him,) in form of dialogues between a Pelagian and a Catholic, under the feigned names of Atticus and Critobulus; Atticus representing the Catholic, and Critobulus the Pelagian. The far greatest part of them, (which I must omit,) is taken up in setting forth the pride and presumption of that tenet of Pelagius, that a man may in this life be without sin; which had been so smartly done by Atticus, that toward the end of the third dialogue, Critobulus, reckoning that he could maintain this to be true in the case of infants at least, if not of grown persons, says thus; [§ 17.]

*Crit.* ‘I can hold no longer; all my patience is overcome by your provoking way of talk. I pray tell me wherein have infants sinned? Neither can the conscience of any fault, nor can their ignorance be imputed to them; who, according to that of the prophet Jonah, know not their right hand from their left. They are in no case to commit sin, and yet they are in a case to perish: their knees double under them; their tender age can utter no words;

<sup>k</sup> Lib. i. Contra Julian. [cap. 5. § 18.]

<sup>l</sup> Sermo i. de Jejunio [apud Basilii Opera, tom. ii. p. 1, &c. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>m</sup> [‘Dialogus contra Pelagianos, libris iii.’—This is printed in vol. ii. p. 683, &c. of Vallarsius’ edition]

‘with a mouth that would speak if it could, they give a smile;  
‘and the torment of eternal misery is prepared for the poor  
‘babes.’

*Att.* ‘Oh! you are grown mighty eloquent,’ &c.———‘But do  
‘not run upon me with your flowers of rhetoric, (which are none of  
‘your own neither,) with which the ears of boys and shallow men  
‘are wont to be caught; but tell me plainly what you would say  
‘of them.’

*Crit.* ‘This I say; grant me but this, that they at least who can-  
‘not sin are without sin.’

*Att.* ‘I shall grant it, provided they be baptized in Christ; and  
‘yet you shall not bring me to yield to your proposition, “that a  
‘person may be without sin if he will.” These have neither power  
‘nor will, but they are free from all sin by the grace of God, which  
‘they receive in baptism.’

*Crit.* ‘You will force me to come to that invidious question, and  
‘to say, what sin had they? That you may make the people  
‘presently throw stones at me; and that when you cannot murder  
‘me by strength, you may by a device.’

*Att.* ‘He murders a heretic that suffers him to continue such,’ &c.

*Crit.* ‘Tell me, I beseech you, and free me from all doubt; for  
‘what reason are infants baptized?’

*Att.* ‘That in baptism their sins may be forgiven.’

*Crit.* ‘What sin have they incurred? Is any one loosed that  
‘never was bound?’

*Att.* ‘Do you ask me? That trumpet of the gospel, that teacher  
‘of the gentiles, that golden vessel shining through all the world,  
‘shall answer you: *Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over  
‘them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression,  
‘who is the figure of him that was to come,*’ &c. [he goes on to recite  
the fifth chapter to the Romans]. ‘And if you object that it is  
‘said, that there were some that had not sinned; understand it,  
‘that they sinned not that sin which Adam committed in paradise,  
‘by breaking God’s command. But all persons are held obnoxious,  
‘either by their own or by their forefather Adam’s sin. He that  
‘is an infant is in baptism loosed from the bond of his forefather;  
‘he that is of age to understand is by the blood of Christ freed,  
‘both from his own bond, and also from that which is derived from  
‘another.’

‘And that you may not think that I understand this in an  
‘heretical [or heterodox] sense; the blessed martyr Cyprian, (whom  
‘you pretend to have imitated in collecting into order some places



‘ of scripture,) in the epistle which he writes to bishop Fidus, about  
 ‘ the baptizing of infants, says thus :

‘ “ If then the greatest offenders, and they that have grievously  
 ‘ sinned against God before, have, when they afterwards come to  
 ‘ believe, forgiveness of their sins ; and no person is kept off from  
 ‘ baptism and the grace : how much less reason is there to refuse an  
 ‘ infant, who being newly born has no sin, save that being descended  
 ‘ from Adam, according to the flesh, he has from his very birth con-  
 ‘ tracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened,” &c.’  
 [§ 18.]

He goes on to recite verbatim all the rest of the epistle to the  
 end ; which I recited before in chap. vi. § 1, and then proceeds :

‘ That holy and accomplished person, bishop Austin, wrote some  
 ‘ time ago to Marcellinus (who was afterward, though innocent, put  
 ‘ to death by the heretics, on pretence that he had a hand in Hera-  
 ‘ clius’ usurpation) two books concerning the baptism of infants,  
 ‘ against your heresy, by which you would maintain that infants are  
 ‘ baptized, not for forgiveness of sins, but for the kingdom of heaven,  
 ‘ according to that which is written in the Gospel, *Except a person*  
 ‘ *be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom*  
 ‘ *of heaven.* And a third book to the said Marcellinus, against those  
 ‘ that say (what you say), that a man may, without the grace of  
 ‘ God, be without sin if he will. And a fourth to Hilarius, against  
 ‘ your doctrine that brings up so many odd things. And, they say,  
 ‘ he is setting out some more books particularly relating to you ;  
 ‘ which are not yet come to my hands. So that I think it proper  
 ‘ for me to spare my pains on this subject ; lest that of Horace be  
 ‘ said to me, “ Never carry timber into the woods.” For either I  
 ‘ must superfluously say the same that he has said : or else, if I would  
 ‘ say any new things, his excellent wit has forestalled all the best.

‘ This one thing I will say, that this discourse may at last have  
 ‘ an end ; either you must set forth a new creed, and after the  
 ‘ Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, baptize infants unto the  
 ‘ kingdom of heaven : or else, if you acknowledge one baptism for  
 ‘ infants, and for grown persons ; you must own that infants are to  
 ‘ be baptized for forgiveness of sins ; sins after the similitude of  
 ‘ Adam’s transgression.

‘ And if the forgiveness of sins, which are the sins of another, do  
 ‘ seem to you unjust, or such as he that could commit no sin himself  
 ‘ has no need of ; then march over to your beloved<sup>n</sup>, who holds that  
 ‘ in baptism are forgiven those old sins which have been committed

<sup>n</sup> Origen.

‘ in a former state in the celestial regions : and so as you are influenced by his authority in your other points, partake with his error ‘ in this too.’ [§ 19.]

Though St. Hierome, after having in these dialogues largely confuted the other errors of Pelagius, do insist but briefly on this proof of original sin from the baptism of infants, as being a matter which had been fully handled by St. Austin in the books he here mentions, and of which I gave some account before<sup>o</sup>, yet this little seems to have nettled and puzzled Pelagius more than all that was said by St. Austin. The Pelagians confessed that adult persons were baptized for ‘ forgiveness of sins ;’ but infants, having no sins, were baptized only for the ‘ kingdom of heaven.’ This was to establish two sorts of baptism : which was contrary to that article of the Constantinopolitan creed, then received in all the world ; ‘ I acknowledge ‘ one baptism for the remission of sins.’ Pelagius could never get clear from this argument. And it appears by his answer, which we shall see presently, that he yielded more to the force of it than of any other.

XXVII. But in the mean time, and quickly after the synod of Diospolis, he published four books *Pro Libero Arbitrio*, ‘ In Defence ‘ of Freewill :’ in which, beside what he has about the point of God’s grace, he does, as St. Austin expresses it, ‘ not by any sly intimation, [as formerly,] but in a most open manner, maintain by ‘ all the force of argument he can, that human nature in infants is ‘ in no manner polluted by derivation<sup>p</sup> [or birth].’ St. Austin gives there an instance of one of his sayings, in the first of the said four books<sup>q</sup>.

‘ All the good or evil for which we are to be praised or blamed, ‘ does not come into the world with us, but is acted by us. For we ‘ are born capable of either of these ; not full [or possessed] of ‘ either of them. And as we are at first formed without any virtue ; ‘ so likewise without any vice. And there is in a person, before the ‘ actings of his own will, nothing but what God has created [or, put ‘ into him].’

When people wondered how he could reconcile this with what he had said in the said synod ; where he had, as was shewed before, anathematized all that held any of these opinions : 1. ‘ that Adam’s ‘ sin hurt himself only, and not mankind :’ 2. ‘ that infants new-born ‘ are in the same state that Adam was before his fall :’ 3. ‘ that infants, though not baptized, have eternal life :’ he invented these

<sup>o</sup> Sect. 6, 7, &c. ad 22.

<sup>p</sup> De Peccato originali, lib. ii. cap. 21.

<sup>q</sup> Cap. 13.

<sup>r</sup> Sect. 24.

salvoes ; which St. Austin mentions in a book written some time afterwards, and which shew that he had a faculty of juggling and equivocation enough for a Jesuit.

1. That it might be said truly enough, that Adam's sin did hurt mankind as well as himself. But how ? ' Not by derivation, but by ' the ill example it gave.' The Socinians may thank him for this explication : for it helps them to much such another about Christ's death doing good to mankind.

2. That infants new-born are not in the same state that Adam was before his fall, is true enough. But for a reason very different from what those bishops, whom he bantered, could imagine ; viz. ' because he was a man, and they are but children.'

3. All the reason he could give for his condemning those that said, ' Unbaptized infants shall have eternal life,' was a saying which he often had in his mouth, ' As for infants that die without baptism, ' I know whither they do not go ; but whither they do go, I know ' not, i. e. I know they do not go to the kingdom of heaven ; but ' what becomes of them I know nott.'

It is plain enough from many places in St. Austin, that his followers held, that they should have a certain ' eternal life,' but not in the kingdom of heaven. But he himself, it seems, at least at this time, to salve what he had said in the synod, renounced those that determined so ; and kept himself in reserve concerning their future state.

St. Austin's note on all this is, ' Does he think that when these ' propositions were set him to condemn in one sense ; he does, by ' expounding them in another sense, make it out, that he did not ' deceive his judges ? So far from that ; that he deceived them so ' much the more slyly, as he now explains himself the more ' craftily<sup>u</sup>.'

XXVIII. The next year two councils were held in Africa, both<sup>316.</sup> about the same time : one at Carthage of sixty-eight (A.D. 416.) bishops, the other at Milevis, for the province of Numidia, of sixty-one bishops. They had not then seen Pelagius' last four books, and had but an imperfect account of what had passed at Diospolis. But they found it necessary to condemn the Pelagian opinions ; which had taken some footing in those countries, but much more at Rome. And therefore they both of them did, by synodical epistles written to Innocent bishop of Rome, desire the concurrence of that church ; not that they thought their own decrees invalid without a confirmation from Rome, but because Rome was

<sup>s</sup> De Peccato origin. ii. cap. 15.

<sup>t</sup> August. *ibid.* cap. 21.

<sup>u</sup> *Ibid.* cap. 16.

most infected. With which desire Innocent did very cordially comply in his answers; which answers, though written the year after, I shall recite here, leaving out both in the epistles and answers the greatest part, which is about grace; but inserting what they say about infants.

316.  
(A. D. 416.)

The Synodical Epistle of the Council of  
Carthage to Innocent<sup>x</sup>.

They take notice of the report that Pelagius had been acquitted at the council of Diospolis, by denying most of the tenets objected to him; and then say,

‘ If Pelagius do seem to your reverence also justly acquitted by those episcopal acts which are said to have passed in the east; yet the error itself, and the impiety which has so many abettors in several places, ought to be condemned by the authority of the apostolic see. Let your holiness then consider, and have a fellow-feeling with us in your pastoral bowels, how mischievous and destructive a thing that is to the sheep of Christ, which follows from their sacrilegious disputations; that we need not *pray that we enter not into temptation,*’ &c. [§ 4.]

They proceed to shew the necessity of praying for God’s assisting grace, from Luke xxii. 32, Eph. iii. 14, &c. And then conclude their letter thus;

‘ They say also, “That infants are not to be baptized for that salvation which is given by Christ as a Saviour;” and so they kill them eternally by their pernicious doctrine. They maintain that, “Though they should not be baptized, yet they would have an eternal life: and that they are not of those of whom our Lord says, *The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost.* For these, say they, were not lost, neither is there any thing in them that needs saving or redeeming at so great a price. For there is nothing in them that is corrupted, nothing that is held captive under the power of the Devil; nor was the blood which was shed for forgiveness of sins, shed for them.” Though Cælestius has by his book, formerly given in to the church of Carthage, owned that infants have redemption by the baptism of Christ. But a great many who are said to be, or to have been, their disciples, do not cease with all their might to uphold these evils; by which they endeavour to overthrow the Christian faith.

‘ So that suppose Pelagius and Cælestius be reformed, or do say that they never held these things, and do deny that any of the

<sup>x</sup> Apud Augustinum, Epist. 90. [175.  
ed. Bened. Also in the Concilia, edit.

Mansi, tom. iv. p. 321.  
<sup>y</sup> Five years before.



‘ writings produced against them are theirs, and the contrary cannot be proved; yet in the general, whoever maintains these tenets, and does affirm, “That human nature can be sufficient of itself to overcome sin, and keep God’s commandments,” and so is an adversary to the grace of God which is plainly proved from the prayers of holy men: and, “Quicumque negat parvulos per baptismum Christi a perditione liberari, et salutem percipere sempiternam;” whoever denies that infants are by Christian baptism delivered from perdition, and brought to eternal salvation; let him be anathema.’

‘ And for the other things that are objected to them, we doubt not but your reverence will, when you shall have seen the episcopal acts which are said to have passed in the east, judge so as to give occasion to us all to rejoice in the mercy of God.’ [§ 6.]

316. The Synodical Epistle of the Milevitan  
(A. D. 416.) council to Innocent<sup>z</sup>.

They represent to him that there was ‘ a new heresy sprung up of men that were enemies to the grace of Christ, who went about to deprive people of the benefit of the Lord’s prayer,’ &c. And after many things said on that subject, they add,

‘ Also they do by a wicked presumption contend that little infants shall have an eternal life, though they be not renewed by the sacraments of the Christian grace; making that of no effect, which the apostle says, *By one man sin entered into the world,*’ &c. [§ 2.]

‘ Therefore to omit many other things which they discourse against the holy scriptures; these two things, which do support the hearts of the faithful, and in which they go about to subvert all our Christianity, viz. “That God is not to be prayed to, to be our helper against the evil of sin, and for working righteousness;” and, “that the sacrament of the Christian grace is not helpful to infants for obtaining eternal life;” these when we have signified to your apostolical breast, we have not need to say much,’ &c. [§ 3.]

There was another letter<sup>a</sup> written to Innocent at the same time, and on the same subject, in a more familiar style, by five bishops, who, I suppose, had some personal acquaintance with him, viz. Aurelius, who had made one at the council of Carthage; Alypius, St. Austin, and Possidius, who had been in the other council; and Euodius, whose name is to neither of them. They give him to understand that they hear there are several at Rome, who do favour Pelagius; some who are brought over to his opinion; others that will not believe he is of that opinion. That in all probability Pela-

<sup>z</sup> Apud Augustinum, Epist. 92. [176. ed. Bened.]

<sup>a</sup> Inter Epistolas Augustini, Epist. 95. [177. ed. Bened.]

gius had imposed upon the bishops at Diospolis; who, when they heard him own the ‘grace of God,’ could think no other but that he meant that grace by which we are made good Christians, and not that only by which we are made rational men: whereas he, in his books (which the bishops of Diospolis had not seen), says to God in effect, ‘Thou hast made us men, but we have made ourselves good ‘men.’ Therefore they advise him to send for Pelagius to Rome, or to deal with him by letters; that if he will explain himself in a catholic sense he may be acquitted indeed. [§ 1—3.]

To that purpose St. Austin sends to Innocent a letter that he had written to Pelagius, desiring him to send it to him; ‘For then,’ says he, ‘he will the rather vouchsafe to read it, regarding more ‘him that sent it than him that wrote it.’ [§ 6 and 15.]

They sent him withal a book of Pelagius; I suppose, that *de Viribus Naturæ*, spoken of in § 22.

<sup>317.</sup>  
(A. D. 417.) Innocent returned three letters in answer to these three. They are the 91st, 93rd, and 96th<sup>b</sup>, that are printed among the letters of St. Austin. He agrees perfectly with them in the points of doctrine, and in the proofs that they had brought for them. And for the case of infants particularly, he says<sup>c</sup>, that which Pelagius and Celestius do teach, viz. that they may have eternal life without baptism, is ‘perfatuum, very absurd.’ He says, they would by this means ‘make their baptism of no use.’ That ‘if it did them ‘no hurt that they are not regenerated, then the same men must ‘hold that the waters of regeneration do them no good.’ [§ 5.] It seems probable by these words, that this pope did not understand how Pelagius distinguished between *eternal life* and the *kingdom of heaven*. In fine, he gives his sentence, that they are to be accounted excommunicate, till they do repent and recant.

And to what St. Austin and the other four had desired, that he would send for Pelagius, or write to him, he answers;

‘He ought rather to come himself, that he may be absolved: for ‘if he be still of the same opinion, when will he ever commit himself to our judgment, how many letters soever be sent him, when ‘he knows he must be condemned? And if he were to be sent for, ‘it might be better done by them that are nearer him, and not ‘separated by so great a space of land. But yet, if he will give any ‘room for medicine, our care shall not be wanting: for he may condemn the opinions he has been of, and send his letters, and ask ‘pardon for his error, as becomes one that returns to us.’ [§ 4.]

<sup>b</sup> [In the Benedictine edition, Nos. 181, 182, 183.]

<sup>c</sup> Epist. 93. [182.]

‘ For his book which you sent, I have read it : in which I find a ‘ great many blasphemous things<sup>d</sup>,’ &c. [§ 5.]

XXIX. These letters of Innocent are dated in January, 417, and <sup>317.</sup> he died the March following. And whether he had before (A. D. 417.) his death wrote to Pelagius, or whether Pelagius had heard of what passed, he did write to Innocent an apologetic letter, and sent withal *Libellum fidei*, ‘ a written account of his faith<sup>e</sup>.’ In which he endeavours both to shew his own faith to be blameless, and also to be even with St. Hierome for his Dialogue : so that Julian calls it an answer to them<sup>f</sup>. But Innocent being dead before they came, they were delivered to Zosimus, who had been chosen bishop in his stead. Cælestius also came thither himself, and published and gave into the hands of Zosimus his ‘ *Libellus*,’ or ‘ Draught of Faith,’ likewise.

Some learned men<sup>g</sup> make Cælestius to have published two treatises at Rome at this time ; one called *Confessio fidei* Zosimo Papæ oblata : and the other, *Ad Zosimum Papam libellus*. And that the *Confessio fidei* was in a manner the same with Pelagius’ *Libellus* in sentences and words. And that Pelagius’ *Libellus* is that which goes under the name of St. Hierome’s *Explanatio Symboli ad Damasum* : and Cælestius’ *Confessio fidei* is for the greatest part the same with that which goes for St. Austin’s *Sermo* 191. [Append. 236.] *de Tempore*.

But Cælestius published but one : which may be called, *Confessio fidei*, or *Libellus fidei*. St. Austin always calls it by the latter name. And that did considerably differ from Pelagius’ *Libellus* ; being (as St. Austin observeth<sup>h</sup>, and we shall see) ‘ much more frank and open ‘ in the denial of original sin.’

And whereas they make one to be like the *Explanatio Symboli* in St. Hierome ; and the other to be in a manner the same with the *Sermo* 191. [236, App.] in St. Austin’s works ; these two are not only in a manner the same, but are the very same, (being Pelagius’ *Libellus* aforesaid,) saving a few various lections, and saving that that in St. Austin’s works has an impertinent preface affixed to the beginning, and a bit cut off from the end by some idle monk, to make it serve for a sermon.

I shall recite it here at large<sup>i</sup>, (though a small part of it only do

<sup>d</sup> Epist. 96. [183.]

<sup>e</sup> [August. de Gratia, &c. I. c. 30. § 32. De Peccato orig. ii. c. 18. § 19.]

<sup>f</sup> Apud Augustin. Operis imperfecti, contra Julianum, lib. iv. c. 88. [tom. x. p. 872.]

<sup>g</sup> F. Garnier [in the treatise subjoined

to Marius Mercator, referred to above, at p. 219.] and Dr. Cave, Hist. literar. in Pelagio et Cælestio. [tom. i. p. 293, 295.]

<sup>h</sup> De Peccato orig. c. 2

<sup>i</sup> [From Hieronymi Opera, tom. xi. p. 146 ed. Vall. or Augustin. Serm. 236 : Op. tom. v. Append. p. 274. ed. Benedict.]

relate to our purpose,) and add a few short notes on it. And this I do for two reasons :

1. For the credit of Pelagius, and of our country. St. Austin always speaks of him as a man of extraordinary capacity and accomplishments ; and one whom he should much admire and love, were it not for his heterodox opinions. And the works of his that are left, do shew him a man of very good parts. There are none left entire but this, and a letter of his to Demetrias. Both that letter is as polite and (as Orosius expresses it) elaborate a piece as any that age afforded ; and also this confession of his faith is as handsomely and learnedly penned as any of the creeds drawn up by private men of that time, whereof there were many ; save that he does not speak  
 317. home to the clearing of that point on which he was  
 (A. D. 417.) questioned. And yet, though these are by much the most ancient pieces extant that ever were written by one born in our country, they have never yet been published in our language.

Secondly, I do it that I may put our Socinians out of love with him. They do much hug some notions of his, which being first dressed up and represented plausible for their turn in French, they have translated and published in English<sup>k</sup>. But they shall see that how well soever he please them in some of their lesser errors ; yet as to their main article he is their mortal enemy, and counts them worthy of an anathema : being as decretory against them as Athanasius, or Austin, or any of the ancient catholic Christians were, whose names they hate.

His creed<sup>l</sup> is this, sent with a letter to pope Innocent, but finding him dead, as I said.

<sup>k</sup> [See above, p. 218 n.]

<sup>l</sup> This creed for so ancient a one (for it is much ancienter than that which goes under the name of Athanasius, and within thirty-six years of the Constantinopolitan) is very express and particular in reference to the holy Trinity : and St. Austin finds no fault with it as to that matter ; he only says, ‘After he has ended a discourse as long as he pleased, from the unity of the Trinity to the resurrection of the flesh, ‘which nobody demanded of him, he says,’ &c.\*

It is to be noted that he had, before he fell into any heresy, written ‘three Books ‘concerning the Faith of the Trinity ;’ which Gennadius, in the catalogue he gives† of Pelagius’ books, commends as useful ones. And since they are lost, this Creed may serve for an abridgment of them.

And here I will make a remark on the title of another book of his, which Gennadius there mentions, which is lost, except a few fragments. For why should not I, as well as others, take a little pride in the mending the writing of an ancient book ? Pelagius gathered together, and published some select places of scripture relating to moral duties and the practical part of religion. Gennadius recites the title of this book. It

\* De Gratia Christi, cap. 32.

† De Script. Eccl. cap. 42.



' We believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible. We believe also in our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom all things were created ; very God, the only begotten, the true Son of God, not a made or adopted one, but begotten : of one substance with the Father, which the Greeks express by *ὁμοούσιον* : and in such a manner equal in all things with the Father, that he cannot be [accounted] inferior either in time, or degree, or power. And we acknowledge him that is begotten to be of the same greatness as he is that begot him.

' And whereas we say, the Son is *begotten* of the Father ; we do not ascribe any time to that divine and ineffable generation ; but do mean, that neither the Father nor the Son had any beginning. For we cannot otherwise confess the Father to be eternal ; unless we do also confess the Son to be co-eternal : for he is called the Father, as having a Son ; and he who ever was a Father, ever had a Son.

' We believe also in the Holy Spirit, very God, proceeding from the Father<sup>m</sup>, equal in all things with the Father and the Son, in power, in will, in eternity, in substance. Neither is there any degree [or *graduation*] in the Trinity ; nothing that can be called superior or inferior, but the whole Deity is equal in its perfection : so that except the words that signify the propriety of the persons, whatsoever is said of one person may very well be understood of all three.'

is in the ordinary editions, 'Pro actuali conversatione Eulogiarum ex Divinis Scripturis liber unus, capitulorum indicibus in modum Cypriani Martyris præsignatus.' *Eulogiarum* there is no sense. So some have put instead of it the Greek *εὐλογίων* ; and others have made other guesses. But I have a very old edition of some of St. Hierome's Works, Ven. 1476, in which this passage of Gennadius is recited at two several places ; in one it is *Eulogiarum*, in the other it is *Æglogiarum* : so that I make no doubt but the true writing was *Eclogarum*. And so the title of the book was plainly this, 'Collections of the Texts of holy scripture concerning a man's actual conversation.' This is that book of his, to which St. Hierome refers, when he in the passage even now recited, speaking to Pelagius, says, 'The blessed martyr Cyprian, whom you pretend to have imitated in collecting into order some places of holy scripture\*, &c.

The same edition † that I mentioned would help to correct several places in the text of St. Hierome himself, which are depraved, and some of them, I doubt, on purpose.

<sup>m</sup> *Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father*] No creed at this time had any more. His procession from the Son also, has been since put into the Constantinopolitan by the Latins. So also afterward, he says nothing of Christ's descent into hades, or hell : which was not as yet put into any creed of the catholics, except that of Aquileia.

\* [Sect. 26. p. 327.]

his own, the last and best collection of St. Jerome's works.]

† [This edition of 1476 is expressly noticed by Vallarsius, in the preface to

‘ And as, in confutation of Arius, we say that the substance of the Trinity is one and the same, and do own one God in three persons ; so avoiding the impiety of Sabellius, we distinguish three persons expressed by their property : not saying that the Father is a Father to himself, nor the Son a Son to himself, nor the Holy Spirit the Spirit of himself ; but that there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit. For we acknowledge not only [several] names, but also properties of the names, that is, persons ; or, as the Greeks express them, hypostases. Nor does the Father at any time exclude the person of the Son<sup>a</sup>, or of the Holy Spirit ; nor again does the Son, or Holy Spirit, receive the name or person of the Father ; but the Father is always Father, the Son always Son, and the Holy Spirit always Holy Spirit : so that they are in substance one thing, but are distinguished by persons and by names.’

‘ And we say that this Son of God, who, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, inherited eternity without any beginning, did, in the end of the world, take upon him, of Mary, who was always a virgin, perfect man of our nature ; and the Word was made flesh, by taking manhood to him, not by altering his Deity.’

‘ And we do not say that the °Holy Spirit was instead of seed, as a certain person does most impiously hold ; [or as some very impious persons hold ;] but that he operated by the power and influence of the Creator.’

‘ And we do in such a manner hold that there is in Christ one person of the Son, as that we say there are in him two perfect and

<sup>n</sup> *Exclude the person of the Son.*] In all the editions both of St. Hierome's and St. Austin's works, which I could see, it is *excludit*. But I guess it is false printed for *includit*, *induit*, *accipit*, or some such word. [*Excludit* stands as before, both in the Benedictine edition of Augustine, and in Vallarsius' St. Jerome, without the least notice of any variety of reading.]

° *Holy Spirit instead of seed.*] I do not remember any sect that held this. Tertulian had, in an allusive way of speaking, said, ‘ Being the Son of God from the seed, that is, the Spirit of God his Father ; flesh without the seed of man was to be taken by him, that he might be the Son of Man. For the seed of any man was not proper for him who had the seed of God\*.’ And St. Hilary, in the same way of speaking, had called it, ‘ The seminative power of the Spirit coming on her†.’ But Pelagius seems to aim at some person or persons then living. In one of my copies it is, ‘ Ut quidam sceleratissimi opinantur.’ But in that elder one that I mentioned, it is, ‘ Ut quidam sceleratissime opinatur.’ I am afraid St. Hierome might have somewhere said some such thing by way of allusion : for Pelagius' chief spite was at him. But I do not remember it. [Both Vallarsius and the Benedictine editors of St. Augustine read *opinantur*.]

\* De Carne Christi, cap. 18.

† Lib. ii. de Trinitate, [sect. 24, 26. p. 800. edit. Benedict.]

‘entire substances, [or natures,] viz. of the Godhead, and of the ‘manhood which consists of soul and body.’

‘And as we do condemn Photinus, who confesses in Christ only a ‘mere man; so we do anathematize Apollinaris, and all of that sort, ‘who say that the Son of God did take on him any thing less than ‘the whole human nature; and that the man [or manhood] which ‘was assumed, was either in body, or in soul, or in mind<sup>p</sup>, unlike to ‘those for whose sake it was assumed; whom we do hold to have ‘been like unto us, saving only the stain of sin, which is not natural ‘to us<sup>q</sup>.

‘We do also abhor in like manner the blasphemy of those who go ‘about by a new interpretation to maintain, that since the time of ‘his taking flesh, <sup>p</sup>all things pertaining to the Divine nature did pass

<sup>p</sup> Or in soul, or in mind.] The words are, ‘Vel in anima, vel in sensu.’ But they must be intended for the translation of ψυχῇ and νοῦς: for Apollinaris said, that Christ’s human nature had ψυχῇν, but not νοῦν.

<sup>q</sup> Sin which is not natural to us.] He takes some advantage of this for his opinion against original sin. But that which was not natural to man, as God made him, is become, in some sense, natural since his depravation.

<sup>r</sup> All things pertaining to the Divine nature did pass into the man, and e contra.] He is large against this impiety, which was held by the Arians and the Apollinarists. The Arians had this aim in teaching it, that by owning the Divine nature of Christ to have suffered, the Christians might fall into their opinion, that this Divine nature was not

259. the same with that of God the Father. Phœbadius had a little before this (A. D. 359.) written a tract against the form of faith drawn up at Sirnium; wherein he mentions\* an epistle of Potamius the Arian, that had disseminated this doctrine, that the Divinity of Christ had suffered. ‘This you do,’ says he, ‘that people should ‘not believe him born of him who is undoubtedly incapable of suffering.’ And Epi- phanius says the same thing of the Arians, Hær. 69.

The Eutychians also ran far into this notion of the communication of properties: but that was a good while after Pelagius’ time.

348. As it is hard for eager spirits to keep the mean, it was but ten years (A. D. 448.) after this, that Nestorius made a very ill use of this same notion of the properties of each nature being incommunicable, to establish an impiety in the other extreme, viz. that the λόγος and the man Christ are two persons. Under pretence of inveighing against one error, he runs into the other. For speaking of his adversaries, he says, ‘They make use of the union of God and man to establish a confused mixture†, &c. They speak of God the Word, who is consubstantial with the Father, as ‘if he had taken the beginning of his origin from the virgin mother of Christ; as if ‘he had been built together with his temple, and buried with his flesh. They say ‘that the same flesh did not remain after his resurrection, but did pass into the nature ‘of the Godhead,’ &c. But then he adds, ‘the virgin, whom many have ventured to ‘call the mother of Christ, they are not afraid to call the mother of God.’

There wanted only the accuracy of speaking, which Pelagius had here used, to clear

\* [Phœbadii Aginnensis episcopi liber adversus Arianos, sect. 5.—Apud Bibl. Patrum, ed. Lugd. tom. iv. p. 301. ed. Gal- landii, tom. v. p. 251.]

† Ad Cælestinum Papam, Epist. i. [apud Concilia, edit. Labb. tom. iii. p. 349. ed. Mansi, iv. 1021.]

‘into the man [or manhood], and so also that all things belonging to the human nature were transferred into God [or the Divine nature]. From whence would follow (a thing that no heresy ever offered to affirm) that both substances, [or natures,] viz. of the divinity and the humanity, would by this confusion seem to be extinguished, and to lose their proper state, and be changed into another thing. So that they who own in the Son an imperfect God and an imperfect man, are to be accounted not to hold truly either God or man.’

‘But we do hold that our nature capable of suffering was so assumed by the Son of God, as that the Divinity did remain incapable of suffering. For the Son of God suffered (not in appearance only, but really) all those things which the scripture speaks of, i. e. hunger, thirst, weariness, pain, death, and the like: but he suffered in that nature which was capable of suffering, i. e. not in that nature which did assume, but in that which was assumed. For the Son of God is in respect of his Godhead incapable of suffering, as the Father; incomprehensible, as the Father; invisible, as the Father. And though the proper person of the Son, that is, the WORD of God, did take on him humanity capable of suffering; yet the Godhead of the WORD in its own nature did not suffer any thing by the inhabiting of the humanity; as did not the whole Trinity, which we must of necessity confess to be incapable of suffering. The Son of God therefore died according to the Scriptures, in respect of that which was capable of dying.’ ‘The third day he rose again. He ascended into heaven. He sits on the right hand of God the Father; the same nature of flesh still remaining in which he was born and suffered, in which also he rose again. For the nature of his humanity is not extinguished, but is glorified, being to continue for ever with the Divinity. Having therefore received of the Father the power of all things in heaven and earth, he will come to judge the living and the dead; that he may reward the just, and punish the sinners.’

‘We do also believe the resurrection of the flesh, in such a manner as to say that we shall be restored again in the same truth of our

and settle that dispute between the Nestorians and Eutychians. He grants here that the Son of God was born, suffered, died, &c., i. e. the same person who is the Son of God; but not in that nature by which he is God, or the Son of God. However, when that feud broke out, the Pelagian party joined their interest with the Nestorian, as I shewed before\*.

\* [Augustine here reads, *‘ita credimus ut.’* but Jerome, as edited by Vallarsius, *‘confitemur et credimus ut,’* &c.]



'limbst, in which we are now; and that we shall for ever remain such as we shall be once made after the resurrection.'

'That there is one life for the saints, but rewards different according to their labour: as on the other side the punishments of wicked men shall be according to the measure of their sins.'

'Baptisma unum tenemus, quod iisdem sacramenti verbis in infantibus quibus etiam in majoribus asserimus<sup>u</sup> esse celebrandum.'

'We hold one baptism, which we say ought to be administered with the same sacramental words to infants<sup>x</sup> as it is to elder persons.'

'If after baptism a man do fall, we believe he may be recovered by repentance<sup>y</sup> [or penance].'

'We receive the Old and New Testament in the same number of books<sup>z</sup> as the authority of the holy catholic church doth deliver.'

<sup>t</sup> *In the same truth of our limbs.*] 'In eadem veritate membrorum in qua nunc sumus.' St. Hierome had inveighed against Rufinus and the Origenists for denying this, and saying that it would be an ethereal body, not of such limbs as we now have: and he had reflected upon the Pelagians, as leaning toward them in many things. But Rufinus had renounced any such opinion; and so does Pelagius here.

In the last clause of this article [*for ever remain such*] he reflects not only on Origen, who believed a great many changes in the future state; but on St. Hierome, who had spoke of hell torments, as if there were hope that they would not be eternal.

<sup>u</sup> [Augustine reads *dicimus*: ed. Benedict.]

<sup>x</sup> [*With the same sacramental words to infants.*] St. Hierome had said, as I repeated before\*, that they must either own that infants are baptized for 'forgiveness of sins,' or else make two baptisms. Pelagius was therefore forced to say as he does here. And Caestius in his Draught of his Faith, which I shall recite presently†, gives this reason why he grants that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins, 'That we may not seem to make two sorts of baptism.'

St. Austin quotes this saying of Pelagius, and some others verbatim‡ as out of his *Libellus fidei*, and makes some animadversions on them. Which makes it so plain that it is Pelagius', that no critic, great or small, has of late years taken it to be St. Austin's own, except the great master of that art, mentioned at § 2. [M. Le Clerc.]

<sup>y</sup> *recovered by repentance.*] This is against the Novatians. In the copy that is in St. Austin's works it is said, 'Primo per reconciliationem, deinde per penitentiam,' 'first by reconciliation [or absolution], and then by repentance [or penance].' That insertion looks like a monk's hand. But the old edition is as I have translated it, [and Vallarsius retains the same text.]

<sup>z</sup> *same number of books.*] Rufinus had then lately published an Exposition on the Apostles' Creed, in which he had given a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, which the catholics owned in opposition to the heretics, exactly agreeing with that of the Protestants; and said, 'These are those which the Fathers have ranked within the canon; and on which they would have our doctrines of faith to depend. But it is to be known that there are some other books which have been called by the ancients not canonical, but ecclesiastical.' Where he reckons 'Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, Maccabees, Hermas, and Judicium Petri.' Which, he

\* Sect. 26.

† Sect. 31.

‡ De Gratia Christi, cap. 32.

‘ We believe that our souls are given by God, and we hold that they are made by him<sup>a</sup>; anathematizing those who say that souls are, as it were, a part of the substance of God<sup>b</sup>. We do also condemn the error of those who say, that the souls have sinned in a former state<sup>c</sup>, or that they have lived in the celestial regions, before they were sent into bodies.’

‘ We do also abhor the blasphemy of those who say that any impossible thing is commanded to man by God; or, that the commandments of God cannot be performed by any one man, but that by all men taken together<sup>d</sup> they may. Or, that do condemn first marriages in compliance with Manichæus, or second marriages in compliance with the Montanists.’

‘ Also we do anathematize those who say, that the Son of God did tell lies by necessity of the flesh; and that because of the human nature which he had taken on him, he could not do all things that he would<sup>e</sup>.’

says, ‘ the ancient Christians would have to be read in the churches; and for other books, they would not have them read in churches at all.’

<sup>a</sup> *souls made by God.*] This is aimed against St. Austin; who inclined to the other opinion, that the soul is by propagation, but never positively asserted either side.

<sup>b</sup> *The soul not a part of the substance of God.*] Against the Manichees and Priscillianists.

<sup>c</sup> *Souls sinned in a former state.*] He clears himself from the suspicion of Origenism as to that particular: but yet some of his party embraced it, that they might the better account for the baptism of infants without owning original sin.

<sup>d</sup> *Commands of God not performed by one man, but by all taken together.*] This is the sentence which Mr. Le Clerc cites as if it were St. Austin’s; to shew that he contradicts St. Hierome; as I mentioned, § 2. And indeed it does not only contradict him, but is levelled at him as a blasphemer: for St. Hierome writing\* against that opinion of Pelagius, that a man may live without sin, had used a long discourse, to shew that those men that are free from some sort of faults are subject to other sorts, and that no man can have all virtues. Pelagius is here in hopes to make heresy and blasphemy out of that.

Also, the other clause of this paragraph about condemning marriage is meant against St. Hierome; who, in many of his works, and particularly in those against Jovinian†, had so excessively commended virginity, that some of his expressions were reproachful to the state of marriage, especially of second marriages; and he had been forced to write an apology to explain his meaning.

<sup>e</sup> *Did tell lies by necessity of the flesh, and that because of the human nature which he had assumed, he could not do all things that he would.*] This is a severe animadversion on St. Hierome; who, in the second of the dialogues which he wrote against Pelagius, being eager in shewing the presumption of that tenet of his, ‘ That it is possible for a man to avoid all sin if he will,’ had argued thus; ‘ I cannot,’ says Christ, ‘ do any thing of myself,’ &c. The Arians here raise a cavil; but the church answer, ‘ that this is spoken in respect of the human nature which he had assumed. You, on the contrary

\* Dial. i. [contra Pelagianos: Op. tom. ii.]

† [Adversus Jovinianum libri duo. Op. tom. ii.]

' We do also condemn the heresy of Jovinian, who says, that in the life to come there will be no difference of merits, [or rewards;]

' say, "I can be without sin, if I will." He can do nothing of himself, that he may shew the truth of human nature. You can avoid all sin; that you may, even while you are in the body, set yourself forth as a God.

' He told his brethren and kindred that he would not go to the feast of tabernacles; and yet it is written afterward, "But when his brethren were gone up, then he also went up to the feast." He said he would not go; and yet afterwards did what he denied he would do. Porphyry snarls at this, and accuses him of inconstancy and change: not considering that all things that give offence are to be referred to the flesh (or imputed to the human nature).'

St. Hierome does not however call this a lie, as Pelagius would represent his words; but an alteration of purpose incident to human nature.

And at another place in the same dialogue, having quoted that saying of our Saviour, *Father, if it be possible, remove this cup from me*: he adds, 'Why, I pray you, does he use the words of one that were in doubt? He had said in another place, *The things that are impossible with men are possible with God*. But being a man, and to suffer, he speaks in the language of a man. He says, *If it be possible, let one hour pass from me*. You say it is possible to avoid sin all one's life.' Not only Pelagius was of opinion that these sayings were irreverent, and did impute sin to our Saviour as a man; but Theodorus also, bishop of Mopsuestia, who was a Pelagian likewise, wrote a treatise, 'Against those that say Men sin by Nature, and not by their Will.' He calls the adversary, whom he there expresses by a feigned name, *Aram*; but he means St. Hierome. Photius gives an abstract of the book\*. And therein Theodorus imputes to his adversary this saying: 'That even Christ, having assumed the human nature which is infected with sin, was not free from wickedness.' But this is to put a very malicious interpretation upon St. Hierome's words, which were indeed not very warily spoken.

The writer of the first of those two letters of the Pelagians against which St. Austin wrote his four books to pope Boniface, made afterward the same spiteful reflection, saying of his adversaries (i. e. the Catholics) in general, that they held (among a great many horrid things which he there heaps up) 'That Christ was not clear from sin; but that he told lies by the necessity of the flesh, and was stained with other sins.' To which St. Austin there† answers, 'Let them look to it whom he has heard say such things, or in whose books he has read something perhaps which he did not understand, and has turned to this slanderous sense by a deceitful malice.' St. Austin speaks so, as that one may guess he knew where they had this, but was not willing to enter into a dispute to vindicate St. Hierome's words.

The eighteen Pelagian bishops had this over again in their letter to the bishop of Thessalonica, as we may see by St. Austin's second book to Boniface, cap. vi. And Julian again, as appears by St. Austin's answer to him, lib. iii. cap. 6. [tom. x. p. 368.]

St. Hierome at many other places owns in plain words, that our Saviour had no sin: and therefore this spiteful advantage ought not to be taken of his words in this one place. Even in these very dialogues, Dial. 2. having shewed that all that are mere men have some failings, he adds, 'To have all things, and to be wanting in nothing, is

\* Bibliotheca cod. 177. [p. 396. edit. Hoeschelii, 1653. Some fragments of this work were published by Noris in his *Historia Pelagiana*; again by Garnier, in his edition of Marius Mercator; and they are very properly appended by Vallarsius to

St. Jerome's dialogues against the Pelagians, in the second volume of his collection of that Father's works.]

† *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum lib. i. ad Bonifac. cap. 12.*



‘and that we shall have there virtues [or graces] which we took no care to have heref.

‘Freewill we do so own as to say, that we always stand in need of God’s help<sup>s</sup>: and that as well they are in an error, who say with Manichæus, that a man cannot avoid sin; as they who affirm with Jovinian, that a man cannot sin. For both of these take away the freedom of the will. But we say, that a man always is in a state that he may sin or may not sin: so as to own ourselves always to be of a freewill.’

‘This is, most blessed pope, our faith, which we have learned in the catholic church, and have always held. In which if there be any thing that is perhaps unwarily or unskilfully expressed; we desire it may be amended by you, who do hold both the faith and the see of Peter. And if this our confession be approved by the

‘peculiar to the virtue of him *who did no sin, neither was any guile found in his mouth.*’

St. Hierome had moreover in the third of these dialogues cited a place in the ‘Gospel of the Nazarenes,’ where Christ is brought in speaking thus, ‘What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized of John, unless this that I have spoken be a sin of ignorance?’ But he does not pretend there that this book is authentical, or to be credited. And yet the Pelagians afterward objected this to him, as if he had by this quotation gone about to establish ‘a fifth Gospel, which taught that Christ did sin.’

‘*And that we shall have there virtues which we took no care to have here.*] St. Hierome had not said so, but he had said something which Pelagius would draw to that sense. He had said, ‘So long as we have this treasure in earthen vessels, and are encompassed with frail and mortal and contemptible flesh, we think ourselves happy, if in some single virtues, or parts of virtue, we do service to God. But when this corruptible shall be clothed on with incorruption, and death shall be swallowed up in the victory of Christ, then God will be all things in all men: so that Solomon will have not only the grace of wisdom, David of meekness, &c, and each two or three virtues; but all will be in each, and the whole number of saints shall triumph in the whole chorus of virtues\*.’ Though these words give no sufficient ground for this calumny, yet the Pelagians ceased not to inculcate their accusation of the doctrine of the catholics upon occasion taken from them. Julian and the seventeen bishops harped upon the same string. For we find St. Austin answering them thus; ‘Who can bear it, when they object to us as if we did say that after the resurrection there will be such a proficiency, that men shall there begin to keep those commands of God which they refused to keep here; and all this because we say that there will be there no sin at all, nor any conflict with the concupiscence of sin? As if they themselves did dare to deny this†.’

‘*We do always stand in need of God’s help.*] St. Austin quotes this sentence, and then says, ‘Here again we would know what sort of help he owns us to stand in need of, and again we find him ambiguous: for he may say that he means the law, and Christian doctrine, by which our natural power is helped,’ &c.‡

\* Dial. i. [sect. 18. p. 699. ed. Vallars.]

† Lib. 3. ad Bonifac. cap. 7.

‡ De Gratia Christi, cap. 33.



‘ judgment of your apostleship ; then whoever shall have a mind to  
 ‘ find fault with me, will shew, not me to be a heretic, but himself  
 ‘ unskilful or spiteful, or even no catholic.’

XXX. Together with this confession of his faith, Pelagius sent a letter to Innocent, apologizing for himself, and endeavouring to shew that he did not in all points hold as his adversaries gave out, and to justify what he did hold. He was very desirous to continue in the catholic church, and not be separated from it. He used great art in reciting the articles objected against him, so as that he could easily answer them or deny them ; and in wording his own opinion, so as he could easily defend them. The letter is lost, except such parts of it as St. Austin has preserved, by quoting them as he had occasion to write animadversions on them. I shall recite only that passage of St. Austin where he quotes that part of the letter which speaks of the baptism of infants, which is this :

*Augustin. de Peccato originali, cap. 17, 18, &c.*

‘ Observe how Pelagius attempted silyly to deceive even the episcopal judgment of the apostolic see in this very question of the  
 ‘ baptism of infants. For in the letter which he sent to Rome to  
 ‘ holy pope Innocent of blessed memory, which finding him not in  
 ‘ the body, was delivered to holy pope Zosimus, and by him trans-  
 ‘ mitted to us : he says,

‘ Se ab hominibus infamari, quod neget parvulis baptismi sacramentum, et absque redemptione Christi aliquibus cœlorum regna promittat.’ ‘ That men do slander him, as if he denied the sacrament of baptism to infants, and did promise the kingdom of heaven  
 ‘ to any persons without the redemption of Christ.’

‘ But these things are not so objected to them as he has set them  
 ‘ down. For they do not deny the sacrament of baptism to infants ;  
 ‘ neither do they promise the kingdom of heaven to any without the  
 ‘ redemption of Christ. So that the thing he complains he is slandered in, he has set down so as that he might easily answer to the  
 ‘ crime objected, and yet keep his opinion. But the thing that  
 ‘ is objected to them is this, that they will not own that unbaptized  
 ‘ infants are liable to the condemnation of the first man, and that  
 ‘ there has passed upon them original sin, which is to be cleansed by  
 ‘ regeneration ; but do contend that they are to be baptized only for  
 ‘ their receiving the kingdom of heaven, &c.—And then mark  
 ‘ how he answers, and mind his lurking-holes of ambiguity, &c.  
 ‘ For, having said,

‘ Nunquam se vel impium aliquem hæreticum audisse, qui hoc  
 ‘ quod proposuit de parvulis, diceret :’ ‘ That he never heard, no not

‘ even any impious heretic, or sectary, who would say that (which he had mentioned) of infants :’

He then goes on, and says,

‘ Quis enim ita evangelicæ lectionis ignarus est, qui hoc non modo affirmare conetur, sed qui vel leviter dicere aut etiam sentire possit? Deinde quis tam impius, qui parvulos exortes regni cœlorum esse velit, dum eos baptizari et in Christo renasci vetat?’ ‘ For who is there so ignorant of that which is read in the gospel, as (I need not say to affirm this, but) in any heedless way to say such a thing, or even to have such a thought? In a word, who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized and born again in Christ, and so make them miss of the kingdom of heaven?’

‘ All this talk is nothing to his purpose. He does not clear himself by this. That infants without baptism cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, is a thing which they themselves never denied. But that is not the question. The question is about the cleansing of original sin in infants: let him clear himself on that point. He will not own that the laver of regeneration has any thing which it need wash off in infants. And let us see what he says next. After reciting that testimony of the gospel, that, *Nisi renatus ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, regnum cœlorum nullus possit intrare: None can enter into the kingdom of heaven that is not born again of water and the Holy Spirit:* about which there is, as I said, no question; he goes on, and says, “ Quis ille tam impius est, qui cujuslibet ætatis parvulo interdicat communem humani generis redemptionem?” “ Who is there so impious as to refuse to an infant, of what age soever, the common redemption of mankind?”

‘ This too is ambiguous, what redemption he means: whether from a bad estate to a good one; or from a good one to a better. For Cælestius did own, in his book at Carthage, the redemption of infants; and yet would not own that sin did pass from Adam on them. But mind his next words, “ Et in perpetuam certamque vitam renasci vetet cum qui natus sit ad incertam?” “ And to hinder him that is born to an uncertain life, from being born again to an everlasting and certain one?” [§ 20.]

St. Austin is something long in conjecturing what he means by these last words: but he pitches on this; that as Pelagius would not own children to be by nature in a state of condemnation, and on the other side granted that they were not born in a state to go to heaven; so he would not determine so positively as some of his abettors did, that they should have an eternal life out of the kingdom of heaven; but left it as an uncertain thing what should become of

them : and therefore said, that they were ' born to an uncertain life ;' but that if they were baptized they would have an ' everlasting life,' and that certainly in heaven. And he quotes on this occasion that saying of his which I mentioned before, ' For unbaptized infants, I ' know whither they do not go ; but whither they do go, I know ' not.' And this phrase of his, *vitam incertam*, is much the same with that which I recited of St. Ambrose<sup>h</sup>, ' Opertam illam pœnarum ' immunitatem,' ' That state of freedom from punishment, which is ' not clear.'

The chief thing I observe in this letter is the confession of Pelagius, that he had never heard, no not even any sectary, deny the sacrament of baptism to infants. For the words of the letter, if we put together the paragraphs which stand disjoined in this animadversion of St. Austin on them, were thus :

' Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants, or did promise the kingdom of heaven to some persons ' without the redemption of Christ : which is a thing that I never ' heard, no not even any wicked heretic, say. For who is there so ' ignorant of that which is read in the gospel, as (I need not say to ' affirm this, but) in any heedless way to say such a thing, or even ' have such a thought? In a word, who can be so impious as to ' hinder infants from being baptized and born again in Christ, ' and so make them miss of the kingdom of heaven ; since our ' Saviour has said, that none can enter into the kingdom of heaven ' that is not born again of water and the Holy Spirit? Who is ' there so impious as to refuse to an infant of what age soever the ' common redemption of mankind, and to hinder him that is born ' to an uncertain life from being born again to an everlasting and ' certain one?'

XXXI. The creed, or book of faith, which Cælestius presented, is nowhere extant. St. Austin has recited some parts of it, which shew plain enough that it differed from that of Pelagius. I will mention one passage which he recites<sup>i</sup>, which is to our purpose.

' Infantes autem debere baptizari in remissionem peccatorum, secundum regulam universalis ecclesiæ, et secundum evangelii sententiam, confitemur ; quia Dominus statuit regnum cœlorum non nisi baptizatis posse conferri : quod quia vires naturæ non habent, conferri necessæ est per gratiæ libertatem. In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes non ideo diximus, ut peccatum ex traduce firmare videamur ; quod longe a catholico sensu alienum

<sup>h</sup> Ch. xiii. § 2.

<sup>i</sup> De Peccato originali, cap. 5 et 6.

‘ est. Quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur, quod postmodum  
 ‘ exercetur ab homine: quia non naturæ delictum, sed voluntatis  
 ‘ esse demonstratur. Et illud ergo confiteri congruum; ne diversa  
 ‘ baptismatis genera facere videamur: et hoc præmunire necessa-  
 ‘ rium est, ne per mysterii occasionem, ad creatoris injuriam, malum,  
 ‘ antequam fiat ab homine, tradi dicatur homini per naturam.’

‘ We own that infants ought, according to the rule of the uni-  
 ‘ versal church, and according to the sentence of the gospel, to be  
 ‘ baptized for forgiveness of sins, because our Lord has determined  
 ‘ that the kingdom of heaven cannot be conferred upon any but  
 ‘ baptized persons: which because it is a thing that nature cannot  
 ‘ give, it is needful to give it by the liberty of grace. But when we  
 ‘ say that infants are to be baptized for forgiveness of sins, we do  
 ‘ not say it with such intent as that we would seem to confirm the  
 ‘ opinion of sin being by derivation [or propagation], which is a  
 ‘ thing far from the catholic sense. For sin is not born with a man,  
 ‘ which is afterward acted by man; because it is demonstrable that  
 ‘ sin is a thing not of nature but of choice. Therefore it is both  
 ‘ proper to own the former, that we may not seem to make two sorts  
 ‘ of baptism; and also necessary to give a caution about the latter,  
 ‘ lest on occasion of the sacrament it be, to the reproach of the  
 ‘ Creator, said, that evil is by nature conveyed to a man before it be  
 ‘ acted by him.’

XXXII. Pelagius expressed himself more slyly in his creed: he said that infants are to be baptized with the same words as elder persons are. St. Austin excepts against that<sup>k</sup>, and says, ‘ It is things  
 ‘ that we regard, and not words only.’ But beside, Pelagius did not  
 nigh so plainly or openly in his creed to Innocent deny original sin,  
 though he had in other books.

But at last Pelagius swallowed this morsel too. For Pinianus,  
 319. Albina, and Melania<sup>l</sup> do certify St. Austin that upon their  
 (A. D. 419.) importunity used with Pelagius to renounce the opinions  
 for which he was censured, he had in their hearing said, *Infantes in  
 remissionem peccatorum percipere baptismum*: ‘ that infants do receive  
 ‘ baptism for remission of sins.’ St. Austin answers<sup>m</sup>, that ‘ that is  
 ‘ indeed more than he had said in his Libellus: for now he does not  
 ‘ say, “with the words of forgiveness,” but confesses that they are  
 ‘ baptized for forgiveness itself. And yet if you should ask him  
 ‘ what sin he thinks is forgiven them, he would maintain that they  
 ‘ had none at all. Who could think that under so plain a confession

<sup>k</sup> De Gratia Christi, cap. 32.

<sup>l</sup> [The persons to whom St. Austin addressed this treatise.]

<sup>m</sup> Ibidem.



‘ a contrary sense could lie hid, if Cælestius had not bolted it out?’ &c.

They that would maintain a dispute, or theological wrestle, and would not take this for a fair fall or baffle, it could be no longer worth the while to contend with them. Pelagius had had at the council of Diospolis some silly sayings objected to him out of a book: and when he denied the book to be his, they asked him, ‘ whether ‘ since he disowned those sayings, he would anathematize those that ‘ said such things?’ He answered<sup>n</sup>, ‘ I anathematize them for fools, ‘ not for heretics; for there is no article of faith spoken of in them.’ But now he himself, when he is driven to this plunge as to grant that infants are baptized for pardon of sins, and yet have no sin, shews himself as absurd as they could be.

But the way by which his partners went about to make sense of this odd saying, we have in a letter of St. Austin to Sixtus<sup>o</sup>, written a good while after these times. There St. Austin having said of the Pelagians, that they are so *Circumstipati et divinarum auctoritate lectionum, et antiquitus tradito et retento firmo ecclesiæ ritu in baptismo parvulorum*, ‘ beset both with the authority of God’s word, and ‘ with the usage of the church that was of old delivered to it, and ‘ has been since kept by it, in the baptizing of children;’ that they dare not deny that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sin; and, that it must not be supposed that the church does this *fallaciter*, ‘ in any trickish or deceitful meaning;’ but *ut fide agatur quod agitur, utique fit quod dicitur*; ‘ since what is acted is acted seriously, that ‘ which is spoken must be supposed to be really done.’ He adds,

‘ That therefore which they have devised to say, when this manifest force of truth weighed them down, what Christian is there ‘ that will not laugh to hear, though he must own it to be very ‘ crafty? For they say that “ infants do indeed answer truly by the ‘ mouths of those that bring them, that they believe in the forgiveness of sins; not that any sins are forgiven to them; but that ‘ they believe that in the church, or in baptism, sins are forgiven to ‘ those that have any, not to those that have none.” And so they ‘ do not yield that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins in ‘ such a sense as that any sins are forgiven to them who, they say, ‘ have none; but that they, though they be without sin, yet are ‘ baptized with that baptism by which is granted forgiveness of sins ‘ to all that have any.’

There will ever be this difference between a man of sense and a

<sup>n</sup> [August. de Gestis Pelagii Palæst. cap. vi. § 16.]

<sup>o</sup> Epist. 105. [194. tom. ii. p. 544. ed. Benedict. cap. 10. § 43. 45.]

thick-skulled man; that the former, if he find himself gravelled, will at least have the modesty to give over talking. Pelagius, after he was brought to this contradiction, kept silence; and we hear no more of him.

But Cælestius blundered through all this, and a great deal more: when he was excommunicated at one place, going to another. And he, after all this, continued to make such a noise in the eastern parts, that the heresy which was called Pelagian in the west, was there called the Cælestine heresy. After several excommunications in par-

<sup>331.</sup>  
(A.D. 431.)  
ticular churches, he was at last pronounced a heretic in the general council or meeting of all the eastern and western bishops at Ephesus.

F. Garnier<sup>p</sup> reckons up twenty-four synods, in several parts of the world, held against this error: whereof this of Ephesus was the last, and the twenty-second was at St. Alban's in Britain, (the year of

<sup>329.</sup>  
(A.D. 429.)  
Christ 429, as bishop Ussher<sup>q</sup> and Garnier out of him do shew): so that, if Pelagius lived to this time, he lived to see himself condemned by his own countrymen.

I shall take notice only of two more artifices that these men used to stave off excommunication, and so dismiss them.

XXXIII. 1. They spoke with words of seeming submission to the bishops to whom they appealed. You see with what a compliment Pelagius concludes the confession of his faith to pope Innocent: and Cælestius began his to Zosimus with one of the like nature. For in the preface of it there were these words<sup>r</sup>, 'that if any mistake have ' by chance happened to me through ignorance, as being a man; it ' may by your skill be corrected:' and when Zosimus asked him if he would<sup>s</sup> 'renounce all those tenets which had been objected to him ' formerly by the deacon Paulinus, and would give his assent to the ' letters of the apostolic see, which had been written by his predecessor of holy memory, he refused to renounce the articles objected ' by the deacon, but he did not dare to oppose the letters of holy ' pope Innocent. Nay, he promised to renounce all things which ' that see did renounce.' This St. Austin repeats from the acts of his examination.

But what do these general words avail, when he, reciting the particulars of his faith, did, as we see, plainly renounce the doctrine of original sin; in an absolute contrariety to the letters of Innocent, to which he pretended to submit.

<sup>p</sup> [In his edition of Marius Mercator, referred to above.]

<sup>q</sup> [Brit. Eccles. Antiq. p. 176. ed. 1687.]

<sup>r</sup> August. de Peccato orig. cap. 6.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. cap. 7.

Yet, as all men have a weak side on which they receive flatterers ; this verbal compliance took so far with Zosimus, that he undertook the patronage of these men against the African bishops ; and wrote  
<sup>318.</sup> several letters on their behalf, and continued so long to  
 (A.D. 418.) hold on their side, till at last he found it too hot to hold any longer ; and then, when he saw they were condemned by the council of Carthage, and by the emperor, and would be condemned by the Christian world, whether he would or no ; he himself wrote an encyclical epistle, as zealous in their condemnation as he had been before in their defence ; a part of which I shall presently recite.

This made Julian and the other following Pelagians say<sup>t</sup>, ‘ that ‘ pope Zosimus and the rest of the clergy of Rome were turncoats.’ Indeed he acted so as to make it plainly appear, that the infallibility of that see is a gift that has been bestowed upon them since that time : for mind the particulars ;

1. Pope Innocent had by his letters dated in January 417, which  
<sup>317.</sup> I mentioned before<sup>u</sup>, fully and plainly condemned the  
 (A.D. 417.) doctrine that denies original sin ; and had condemned Pelagius and Cælestius unless they did recant.

2. Pope Zosimus sometime in the summer of the same year, upon Cælestius’ application to him, ‘ sat on a day of hearing in St. Clement’s church,’ &c.——‘ and caused Cælestius’ *Libellus* which he ‘ had given in [this is the same *Libellus fidei*, or Creed, of which I ‘ just now cited a part, denying original sin] to be read over.’ And he writes a letter to the African bishops, that he had done so, (which is his third epistle extant, tom. 1. *Conciliorum*<sup>x</sup>.) wherein he blames them as having been too hasty in censuring Pelagius and Cælestius, and sends a copy of Cælestius’ *Libellus* to them, and orders thus ; ‘ Either within two months let somebody come that may convict him ‘ to his face, of holding other opinions than he has set down in his ‘ books and confession ; or else, after such plain and manifest declarations made by him, let your holiness know that there is no doubt ‘ remaining, viz. but that he is to be acquitted.’

3. A little while after, viz. September 21st, he writes another letter to them<sup>y</sup>, that he now had received Pelagius’ letter and *Libellus* likewise ; and a letter from Praylius bishop of Jerusalem, in his behalf. That ‘ these had been publicly read over ; and that the ‘ contents of them were all to the same purpose, sense, and tenor ‘ with what Cælestius had produced before. Oh, brethren ! that

<sup>t</sup> August. contra duas Epist. Pelag. ad Bonifac. lib. ii. cap. 3.

<sup>u</sup> § 28.

<sup>x</sup> [Tom. ii. p. 1558. edit. Labb.—tom. iv.

p. 350. edit. Mansi.]

<sup>y</sup> Zosimi Epist. quarta, tom. i. Conciliorum. [tom. ii. p. 1561. ed. Labb. tom. iv. p. 353. edit. Mansi.]



‘any of you had been present at the reading of them. What joy there was of the holy men that were present!——Some could scarce forbear weeping, *tales etiam [l. tam] absoluta fidei infamari potuisse*, that it should be possible for such men of so unrebukable a faith to be slandered.’——Then he inveighs against their accusers, and at last says, ‘If the father rejoice at the return of his son that had been dead, and was alive again, had been lost, and was found, &c., how much greater rejoicing of our faith is this, that these men, of whom false stories were reported, never were dead nor lost! I have sent therefore to your charity copies of the writings which Pelagius sent,’ &c.

4. Zosimus declared that *Libellus* of Cælestius (in which he says, <sup>317.</sup> as I rehearsed before, that ‘the opinion of sin being *ex* (A.D. 417.) ‘*traduce*, by derivation or propagation, is far from the catholic sense’) to be catholic, or orthodox. This will appear by the next quotation.

5. The African bishops wrote<sup>z</sup> answer to Zosimus the latter end <sup>317.</sup> of this year, wherein they plead, ‘That Cælestius ought (A.D. 417.) ‘to clear himself at another rate than that of saying in general, that he would assent to the letters of pope Innocent. That he ought to be compelled to recite and condemn those ill things which he had put in his *Libellus*: lest, if he did not do that, a great many persons of weak judgments might be more ready to think that those doctrines, poisonous to our faith, which were in his *Libellus*, were approved by the apostolic see, because that see had said that that *Libellus* was catholic; than they would be to think them corrected by it, because he said he would assent to pope Innocent’s letter.’ And the next year the same bishops in a fuller meeting send him another letter to the same purpose, but more peremptory; wherein, without any more staying for his consent, or joining with them, they determine that Pelagius and Cælestius are to be accounted excommunicate till they do recant, &c.

6. Then at last, when the emperor also had declared to the same <sup>318.</sup> purpose, Zosimus himself likewise condemned these men, (A.D. 418.) and the opinions they held against original sin, as well as the rest of the world did, and his own predecessor had done; and sent, as I said, an encyclical or circular letter about to the churches, declaring his excommunication of them. A part of it is recited by St. Austin, in these words<sup>a</sup>; ‘Our Lord is faithful in his words; and his baptism has the same plenitude [or force] in deed that it

<sup>z</sup> August. ad Bonifac. lib. ii. cap. 3, 4.

<sup>a</sup> Epist. 157. ad Optatum. [190, ed. Benedict. cap. vi. §. 23.]



‘ has in words ; I mean, in its operation, in the owning the true forgiveness of sins, in all sexes, ages, and conditions of mankind. For none is made free, but who was a servant of sin ; nor can any be said to be redeemed, but who was before truly a captive by sin ; as it is written, *If the Son do make you free, ye shall be free indeed* : for by him we are spiritually regenerated, by him we are crucified to the world ; by his death that bond, contracted by propagation, of death brought upon us all by Adam, and transmitted to every soul, is cancelled ; and there is not any one of all that are born, but what is bound and liable to that bond, until he be by baptism freed from it.’ Here he sings the same tune with his predecessors ; thanks to the African bishops.

And the church of Rome from that time has been very zealous in the same doctrine, till now in this last age they are grown great latitudinarians in this matter. The Jesuits have of late set themselves strongly to overthrow St. Austin’s doctrine of prædestination : and, not content with that, have pushed their arguments so far as to undermine the doctrine of original sin. And the court of Rome shews so much favour to their endeavours, that it is probable they would (if they could avoid the slur that would thereby be brought on their infallibility) once more declare for Pelagius.

It seems that a book of cardinal Sfondrata<sup>b</sup>, which denies the

<sup>b</sup> [Entitled, ‘*Nodus Prædestinationis ex sacris Litteris Doctrinaque Sanctorum Augustini et Thomæ, quantum homini licet dissolutus, a Cælestino S. R. E. Card. Sfondrato.*’ 4<sup>o</sup>. Romæ 1696.

On the appearance of this work, the prelates of France took alarm, and their sentiments not only came before the public, but were communicated officially to the pope. Le Tellier, archbishop of Rheims, their primate, wrote a letter on the subject, which was published under the title of ‘*Sentiment de M. Le Tellier, Archevêque de Rheims, sur le livre du Cardinal Sfondrate, qui a pour titre, Nodus Prædestinationis, &c., contenu dans une lettre de ce prélat, du 14 Janvier 1697.*’—12<sup>o</sup>.

This was soon followed by a letter addressed (on Feb. 21, 1697) to Innocent, by the archbishop and other French prelates, (among them were De Noailles and Bossuet,) against the work. Innocent returned an answer on the 6th of May ; and both letter and answer were translated into Latin, and published at Paris in the same year, 1697.

In 1698 appeared a burlesque piece, entitled, ‘*Appendix ad Nodum Sfondratianum ; sive Litteræ Parvulorum sine*

*Baptismo mortuorum, scriptæ e limbis ad suæ quietis perturbatores.*’ 8<sup>o</sup>. Coloniæ 1698.

In the next year, ‘*Disputatio notarum quadraginta, quas scriptor anonymus Card. Cælestini Sfondrati libro, cui titulus, Nodus Prædestinationis, inussit,*’ was published in his vindication, 8<sup>o</sup>. Coloniæ. And in 1700 came forth the piece named by Dr. Wall, bearing this title : ‘*Collectio variorum Scriptorum adversus librum cui titulus, Nodus Prædestinationis ; sive Augustiniana ecclesiæ Romanæ doctrina a Card. Sfondrati Nodo extricata, per varios sancti Augustini discipulos.*’ Coloniæ 12<sup>o</sup>. 1700.

The cardinal’s book was reprinted in 1705 ; and two years afterwards Louis P. de Vaucel, the translator and editor of the letters to and from pope Innocent, published a volume of Animadversions upon it, by himself, the archbishop of Rheims and others, 4<sup>o</sup>. Cologne 1707. Whether Sfondrata published any thing more upon this subject does not quite appear : but the editor of his *Nodus* names in the preface, among other pieces left by the cardinal at his death, ‘*Dissertationes eruditissimæ duæ contra hæreticos de Baptismo Infantium.*’]

propagation of original sin, and any punishment of unbaptized infants, finds so much favour, that though several French bishops demanded judgment of the pope against it, they could obtain none. On the contrary, Innocent XII recommended the printing of it. And there was lately printed an address to the assembly of French bishops, anno 1700, that they would censure it; but without any success that I have heard of: the title whereof is, *Augustiniana Ecclesie Romanæ doctrina*, &c. The book I have not seen, but an abstract of it in the common prints from Holland. It shews, it seems, that such a book as the aforesaid gives occasion to the heretics to say, That Rome is turning Pelagian.

Zosimus might have been fallible in the case of Pelagius himself, and might have been excused; because he in great measure concealed his opinion in his letter and Libellus: so the mistake might be only in matter of fact. But Cælestius' Libellus spoke open enough; and yet he declared it catholic: and that not as a private man, but sitting in judicature on a day of hearing in St. Clement's church. And F. Garnier grants, and even proves<sup>c</sup> by good reasons, that this was done in a synod.

XXXIV. St. Austin endeavours to throw a cloak over the nakedness of this pope. For when the Pelagians afterward claimed him as theirs; and said, he must be so, or else he must be owned to have declared contrary to himself; and urged the letters aforesaid; St. Austin pleads<sup>d</sup>:

1. That Zosimus did not in any of his letters deny original sin. True, but he declared that Libellus of Cælestius to be catholic, which did openly deny it to his face.

2. <sup>e</sup>That Zosimus urged Cælestius to assent to the letters of pope Innocent; which letters maintained the true doctrine. This indeed shews that Zosimus did not perceive a plain contradiction when it came in this way.

3. He takes a charitable advantage of those words in the preface of Cælestius, 'That if any mistake have happened to me, &c., it may 'by your skill be corrected.' And says<sup>f</sup>, 'whereas Cælestius put 'this [denial of original sin] into his Libellus, only among those 'things of which he owned himself as yet to doubt, and to desire 'to be instructed; it was the desire of instruction (in a man of good 'wit, who, if he had been reformed, might have done a great deal 'of good) that was approved; and not his false doctrine. And in 'that sense his Libellus was pronounced catholic; because this is the

<sup>c</sup> Dissert. de Synodis in causa Pelagiana.

<sup>d</sup> Ad Bonifac. lib. ii. cap. 3.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. cap. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. 3.

‘ part of a catholic mind, if it has any opinions contrary to the truth, not to define them positively, but renounce them when they appear to be such.’

We must commend St. Austin’s charity both to Zosimus and Cælestius. But, as Vossius and bishop Ussher observe, he that reads Zosimus’ letters will see that for a long time he defended Cælestius, not as one that was in an error, and was willing to be taught better; but as one that was in no error, but had approved himself to have *absolutam fidem*, (as he in his third and fourth epistle calls it,) a faith absolved from all blame. So that, how favourable an account soever

<sup>440.</sup> St. Austin gives of this matter; Facundus tells it thus: (A. D. 540.) ‘ Zosimus, contrary to the sentence of Innocent his predecessor, commended the faith of Pelagius and of his partner Cælestius, and blamed the bishops of Africa for counting them heretics.’

One thing indeed St. Austin there says, which is a good answer to the Pelagians, who accused the church of Rome of changing sides, and prevaricating in their doctrine when Zosimus turned against them; viz. that if Zosimus did ever declare for them and their doctrine, that rather ought to be accounted the prevarication. ‘ For,’ says he<sup>b</sup>, ‘ when in reverend Innocent’s letters which say that infants, if they be not baptized in Christ, will remain in eternal death, the ancient catholic faith is set forth; he certainly ought to be accounted the turncoat of the Roman church, that should have deviated from that sentence; which by God’s mercy was not done.’

XXXV. Another thing that Pelagius and Cælestius pleaded was, that supposing they were mistaken in their opinion that there is no original sin; yet this ought not to be accounted heresy, nor to deserve excommunication. It was no article of our faith to hold one way or the other; it was but one of the questions of lesser moment.

For Cælestius, says St. Austin<sup>i</sup>, ‘ spoke in the ecclesiastical acts at Carthage after this manner; “ I told you before concerning the derivation of sin, that I have heard several in the catholic church deny it, and some I have heard affirm it. It is a matter of controversy, not of heresy. As for infants, I always said that they stand in need of baptism, and that they are to be baptized. What would he have more?” He spoke this with an intent to signify, that if he had denied that infants ought to be baptized, then indeed it might have been judged heresy: but now that he confesses that

<sup>s</sup> [Defensio Concilii Chalcedonensis, lib. vii. cap. 3.—edit. Lutet. Par. (una cum Optato) 1676.]

<sup>b</sup> Ad Bonifac. lib. ii. cap. 4. § 8.

<sup>i</sup> De Peccato originali, cap. 22, 23, 24.



‘ they are to be baptized, though he give not the true reason of their baptism; yet he supposes he does not err in a matter of faith, and therefore is not to be accounted a heretic.

‘ Also in the *Libellus* which he gave in at Rome, when he had spoke as much as he pleased in declaring his faith from the Trinity of one Deity down to the resurrection of the dead, concerning which matters nobody ever demanded or objected any thing to him; when he comes to the matter in hand, he says, “and if any questions have arisen which many people dispute about; I have not determined any thing by definitive authority, as if I would be the author of any dogma [or article of faith]; but I offer those things which I have collected from the fountain of the prophets and apostles to be tried by the judgment of your apostleship, &c. “You see his purpose of this prefacing is, that if he be found in a mistake, he may seem not to mistake in the faith, but in some questions that are beside the faith, &c.—But he is much out of the way in thinking so. These questions, which he thinks to be beside the faith, are of a very different nature from those in which one may be ignorant, or mistake, without hurt to the faith; as for example, if a question be put, where the garden of paradise is, &c.? But in the concerns of those two men, by the first of whom we are sold under sin, and by the other redeemed from sin, &c., the Christian faith does properly consist.”’

And afterward: ‘ Therefore whosoever does maintain that human nature, in any age whatever, does not stand in need of the second Adam for a physician, as not being defiled in the first Adam; this man’s mistake is not in a question in which one may doubt or err without hurt to the faith, but he is convicted as an enemy of God’s grace, by the very rule of faith, by which we are Christians<sup>k</sup>.’

XXXVI. The most material thing to our purpose to be observed from these passages of the latter part of this history, is this; how exceedingly the Pelagians were pressed with this argument taken from the baptism of infants; and to how many absurdities they were driven in answering of it. Sometimes they said they were not baptized for forgiveness, but for something else. Sometimes they owned they were baptized for forgiveness, not that they had any sin, but that the uniformity of the words might be kept; or because they were baptized into the church, where forgiveness was to be had for those that wanted it; or because they were baptized with a sacrament which had the means of forgiveness for any that had sinned, or should sin. And some flew to that, that infants have sin, though

<sup>k</sup> De Peccato originali, c. 29.



not by propagation from a sinful stock; but either before they were born, in a former state, or since they were born, by peevishness, &c. Since these men resolved not to own original sin in infants; how much had it been for their turn to deny that they were to be baptized at all! If they had known of any church or society of Christians, then in being, or that ever had been, that had disowned infant-baptism; their interest would have led them to allege their example, or to plead it in their own behalf. But far from that, Cælestius does own that infants are to be baptized according to the 'rule of the universal church;' and Pelagius moreover confesses (the same thing in effect that St. Austin in another place urges) that 'he never had heard, no not even any impious heretic or 'sectary, that denied infants' baptism;' and that 'he thought there 'could not be any one so ignorant as to imagine that infants could 'enter the kingdom of heaven without it.' You have their words before, § 29, 30.

And if there had been any such church of antipædobaptists in the world, these two men could not have missed an opportunity of hearing of them, being so great travellers as they were: for they were born and bred, the one here in Britain, the other in Ireland. They lived the prime of their age (*diutissime*, a very long time, as St. Austin testifies<sup>l</sup>) at Rome, a place to which all the people of the world had then a resort. They were both for some time at Carthage in Africa. Then the one settled at Jerusalem, and the other travelled through all the noted Greek and eastern churches in Europe and Asia. It is impossible there should have been any church that had any singular practice in this matter, but they must have heard of them. So that one may fairly conclude, that there was not at this time, nor in the memory of the men of this time, any Christian society that denied baptism to infants. This cuts off at once all the pretences which some antipædobaptists would raise from certain probabilities, that the Novatians or Donatists, or the British church of those times, or any other whom Pelagius must needs know, did deny it. I shall however more particularly consider those probabilities at another place<sup>m</sup>.

XXXVII. Besides the passages I have here recited of this controversy, St. Austin wrote a great many more, which I must omit, because the reciting of them all would make a large volume of itself. Several whole books, and many long epistles, he wrote to several men against the doctrine of Pelagius, where he always makes use of the argument taken from the constant use of the church in bap-

<sup>l</sup> De Peccato originali, cap. 21.

<sup>m</sup> Part ii. ch. 4.

tizing infants, to prove it to be the general sense that they have original sin.

I will only give the names of some of them, that they that have a mind to read more of this matter, may have recourse to them, if they please.

\* Augustini ad Valerium, de Nuptiis et Concupiscentia. Two books.

\* Ad Bonifacium, contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum. Four books.

† Enchiridion. One book.

\* De Gratia et libero Arbitrio. One book.

\* De Correptione et Gratia. One book.

\* De Prædestinatione Sanctorum. One book.

\* De Dono Perseverantiæ. One book.

\* Contra Julianum Pelagianum. Six books complete, and other six left imperfect.

\* De Gestis Palæstinis. One book.

† De octo Dulcitii Quæstionibus. One book.

§ Comment. in Psalm. li. I was shapen in iniquity, &c.

|| Sermo x. item xiv. de verbis Apostoli. item in sancti Johannis natiuitatem.

¶ Letters to Paulinus, to Optatus, to Sextus, to Cælestinus, to Vitalis, to Valentinus, and several others.

All these I pass over, saying that as I have already here and there fetched in some passages of them, I shall at the end of this chapter recite two or three that will shew how the state of this controversy stood between St. Austin and Julian, some years after Pelagius had been condemned and given over disputing.

But first, I must give an account of a canon of the council of <sup>318.</sup> Carthage held anno 418, about this matter: which is one (A.D. 418.) of the eight that have formerly by a vulgar error been attributed to the council of Milevis, held anno 416. Whereas the council of Milevis did only write their sentence in a synodical letter to Innocent; which letter, together with that of the council of Carthage of the same year, I recited before<sup>o</sup>. That was in the year 416. And the next year, 417, there was another meeting of the bishops at Carthage, of which nothing is extant, save that it appears by some passages of St. Austin recited before, § 33, and some others recited § 15, that they declared that they could not acquiesce in that judgment which pope Zosimus had passed in favour of Cælestius; of which they advertised Zosimus by their letter.

[\* The pieces thus marked are to be found in the 10th volume of the Benedictine edition of St. Austin's works.]

[† Ibid. vol. 6.]

[§ Ibid. vol. 4.]

[|| Ibid. vol. 5.]

[¶ Ibid. vol. 2.]

<sup>o</sup> § 28.

But the next year after, viz. 418, there was a full assembly at Carthage of the bishops of all the provinces of Africa, 214 in number. Then it was they sent that peremptory letter to Zosimus, which I spake of. And then also they passed eight canons against the Pelagian tenets.

In the second they mention the baptism of infants, condemning two errors about it. One, of those who thought that an infant must upon no account be baptized before he be eight days old. I shewed before<sup>p</sup>, that one Fidus, a bishop near Carthage, had held so 150 years before; and it seems some people were still of that opinion. The other, of those that held that absurd opinion, (which Pelagius and Cælestius had made their last refuge,) that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins, and yet have no sin. The canon is this;

*Conciliū Carthag. anno 418<sup>q</sup>. Canon secundus.*

‘ Item placuit, ut quicumque parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum  
<sup>318.</sup> ‘ baptizandos negat; aut dicit in remissionem quidem pec-  
 (A.D. 418.) ‘ catorum eos baptizari, sed nihil ex Adam trahere ori-  
 ‘ ginalis peccati, quod regenerationis lavaero expiatur; (unde fit  
 ‘ consequens ut in eis forma baptismatis in remissionem peccatorum  
 ‘ non vere sed false intelligatur;) anathema sit. Quoniam non  
 ‘ aliter intelligendum est, quod ait apostolus, *Per unum hominem*  
 ‘ *peccatum intravit in mundum, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes*  
 ‘ *homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt*: nisi quemadmodum  
 ‘ ecclesia catholica ubique diffusa semper intellexit. Propter hanc  
 ‘ enim regulam fidei, etiam parvuli qui nihil peccatorum in semet-  
 ‘ ipsis adhuc committere potuerunt, ideo in peccatorum remissionem  
 ‘ veraciter baptizantur, ut in eis regeneratione mundetur, quod  
 ‘ generatione traxerunt.’—————

‘ Also we determine, that whosoever does deny that infants may  
 ‘ be baptized when they come fresh from their mothers’ womb; or  
 ‘ does say, that they are indeed baptized for forgiveness of sins, and  
 ‘ yet that they derive no original sin from Adam, (from whence it  
 ‘ would follow that the form of baptism for forgiveness of sins is in  
 ‘ them not true, but false,) let him be anathema. For that saying  
 ‘ of the apostle, *By one man sin entered into the world, and death by*  
 ‘ *sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that [or, in whom] all*  
 ‘ *have sinned*, is to be understood in no other sense than as the ca-  
 ‘ tholic church spread over all the world has always understood it.

<sup>p</sup> Chap. vi. § 1.

<sup>q</sup> [Labbe (see Concilia, tom. ii. p. 1538.) assigns these canons to the Milevitan

council of 416: and Mansi adheres to that arrangement, tom. iv. p. 325.]

‘ For by this rule of faith, even infants, who have not yet been capable of committing any sin in their own persons, are in a true sense baptized for forgiveness of sins, that in them what was derived by generation may be cleansed by regeneration.’——

Here this canon ends in most copies: but in some there is a further clause against such as allow an eternal life in happiness to unbaptized infants, though not in the kingdom of heaven. I shall have occasion to recite that clause, and my opinion about it, in the next chapter. [§ 6.]

The reader will without any admonition perceive the mistake of those men, who speak of this canon as if infant-baptism were established by it as a thing that had been questioned, or was then newly brought into use. It appears with plainness more than enough, that as well the makers of this canon, as they against whom it was made, did both of them look on the thing itself as undoubted; they differed about some of the reasons or effects of it only.

But Grotius did very unkindly give an occasion to vulgar ignorant people to run into this mistake, by that saying of his, recited chap. vi. § 4, that ‘ there is in the councils no earlier mention of infant-baptism than in the council of Carthage:’ meaning this, or that two years before. Whereas he himself might know well enough, that beside the other passages in authors, and beside the councils I mentioned in chap. xvi. it is mentioned in one of the first councils of which we have any good account since the apostles’ time, as I shewed in the aforesaid sixth chapter.

XXXVIII. Pelagius and Cælestius being thus condemned, and the bishops that would not subscribe to their condemnation being deprived, which were eighteen in number in all the western empire; they made remonstrances, and sent about into the East to several places, but found no countenance. Yet Julian, who had been bishop of Eclanum in Italy, and was the best penman among them, maintained the dispute with St. Austin for some years; each of them

330.  
(A.D. 430.) writing twelve books one against the other. And St. Austin died while he was writing the last six.

If they had said any thing new in reference to our subject, it had been necessary to relate it: but there being nothing new, I shall only recite two or three passages, to shew that they spoke about infant-baptism in the same tenor as before.

After the condemnation, one of the Pelagian party sent a letter to some of the clergy at Rome, hoping to retrieve an interest there. St. Austin thought it was written by Julian, and answers it as his.



But Julian disowned it; and St. Austin was content they should ascribe it to which of their sect they pleased. In it they say many things to clear themselves; and, among the rest, this which is <sup>320.</sup> recited by St. Austin<sup>r</sup>: ‘we do acknowledge that the (A.D. 420.) ‘grace of Christ is necessary for all, both grown persons ‘and infants; and we renounce all that should say that one that is ‘born of parents both baptized ought not to be baptized.’ And so in the letter which all the eighteen of them subscribed and sent to the East, ‘we own baptism to be necessary for all ages<sup>s</sup>.’

To which St. Austin answers, ‘What does it signify that they do ‘own baptism to be necessary for all ages, (which the Manichees ‘hold is needless for any age,) so long as they suppose it has no ‘effect in infants for the forgiveness of sint<sup>t</sup>?’

And speaking to Julian himself, ‘As to the question of baptism, ‘about which you complain that there is a great odium raised ‘against you among ignorant people by our lies, it is strange how ‘neatly you come off. You clear yourself of this odium, by owning <sup>321.</sup> ‘that “infants are to be baptized; because,” you say, (A.D. 421.) ‘“the grace of baptism is not to be altered for the causes ‘[or subjects] of it; since it dispenses its gifts according to the ‘capacity of those who come to it. And so Christ, who is the ‘Redeemer of his own workmanship, does by a continued bounty ‘increase his benefits towards his image; and those whom he had ‘made good at first, he makes better, by renewing and adopting ‘them<sup>u</sup>.”

‘Is this all you have to say why there should be no odium raised ‘on you about the baptism of infants? as if any of us had said that ‘you deny that infants ought to be baptized? you do not say that ‘they ought not to be baptized; but according to your great ‘wisdom you say certain strange things. You say, they are baptized in the sacrament of the Saviour; but yet they are not saved ‘from any thing. They are redeemed by it, you say, and yet they ‘are not delivered from any thing by it.’——

And at the end of the chapter, ‘They are strange things that you ‘say. They are new things that you say. They are false things ‘that you say. As strange, we are amazed at them; as new, we ‘are shy of them; as false, we confute them.’

And again, chap. 5, having produced a great many proofs that infants have need of the grace of Christ for acquitting them from the guilt of a corrupted nature, he says to Julian,

<sup>r</sup> Lib i. ad Bonifac. cap. 22.

<sup>t</sup> Lib. iv. ad Bonifac. c. 4.

<sup>s</sup> Apud August. lib. iii. ad Bonifac. cap. 25.

<sup>u</sup> Lib. iii. advers. Julian. cap. 3.

‘ If you would come to be of this mind, you would own the grace of God toward infants in its true and natural sense. And you would not be put to those shifts, to say things impious and absurd; either that infants are not to be baptized, which perhaps you will hereafter say; or that so great a sacrament is in their case such a mockery, as that they are baptized in a Saviour, but not saved from any thing; that they are washed in the laver of regeneration, but have nothing washed off in it, &c. And all this, because you are afraid to say, they should not be baptized; lest not only the men should spit in your faces, but the women also should throw their sandals at your heads.’

In the sixth book, cap. 3, he puts Julian in mind of his own baptism in infancy; and how ungrateful a thing it is for him to disown the forgiveness of sin, that was granted to him therein.  
286.  
 (A. D. 386.) ‘ Your good father,’ says he, (St. Austin had been acquainted with his father,) ‘ ran with you, little thinking how ungrateful you would be for that merey.’

Though St. Austin does over and over again tell the Pelagians, that nobody accused them of denying baptism to infants; yet it is probable it was him himself they meant to have raised that odium against them among the vulgar. For he speaks here and at other places, as if he thought they had a great mind to deny it, if they could have had the face. He had formerly in a sermon<sup>x</sup>, (which he had preached against them, and which was published,) after many things said to prove that infants have sin, and that it is for that they are baptized, added this; ‘ *Nemo ergo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas. Hoc ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit: hoc a majorum fide perceptit; hoc usque in finem perseveranter custodit: quoniam non est opus sanis medicus, sed ægrotantibus,*’ &c. ‘ Therefore let nobody whisper [or insinuate] any strange doctrines to you. This the church has always had, and ever held; this it has received from the faith of its ancients, and this it keeps constantly to the end, that the whole have no need of a physician, &c. What need then has an infant, if he be not sick?’ &c.

But whoever it were that had raised this report, the Pelagians did always carefully and industriously declare their disowning of any such thought or purpose. For, as Pelagius, in his letter before rehearsed, declares that neither he himself, nor any one in the world that he knew or had ever heard of, was ever so ignorant or so impious, as ‘ either to say so, or have such a thought:’ so likewise Julian was so enraged against any that insinuated that he or his party denied,

<sup>x</sup> Sermon. 10. de Verbis Apostoli. [Sermon. 176. cap. 2. tom. v. p. 584. ed. Benedict.]

or ever meant to deny it; that he sticks not to anathematize all that deny it: for so are his words, ‘We are so far from denying it to be profitable to all ages, that we allot an eternal anathema to those that say it is not necessary even for infants<sup>y</sup>.’

Yet Marius Mercator would needs have it, that their inward sense was against it: only to keep up their credit with Christians they in words and declarations owned it. This he goes about to prove by consequences from their other doctrines; and then says, ‘So that it is plain you must think that they need not to be baptized: only you impose upon us in your words, but in your heart you hold the impiety of Jews and heathens<sup>z</sup>.’ This was hard, when they made such protestations to the contrary. He had no other reason than

<sup>331.</sup> that it would best have fitted with their other doctrines. (A. D. 431.) But Mercator wrote his tract ten years after this of Julian; so that it could not be him that Julian meant.

XXXIX. Theodorus, who was at this time bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, was in this question of the mind of the western Pelagians. And Julian, when he was deprived, retired to him. Some will have it that he was elder in this sentiment than Pelagius himself.

<sup>292.</sup> It might be so, for he was bishop from the year 392 to (A. D. 392.) 428. However that be, he seems to have concealed this, <sup>328.</sup> as well as some other heterodox tenets he had, all his lifetime: they were discovered afterward by some writings he left. He had such singular opinions, especially about the authority of some books of scripture, that he was, after his death, condemned in some general councils for a heretic in greater points than this. This condemnation of him shews the weakness of the argument of a modern writer<sup>a</sup>, who would prove that the canon of Scripture was not settled in the church at this time, because he rejected some books of it. He shews that he did that, forgetting to tell us that he was therefore condemned as a heretic.

As for the book he wrote on the Pelagian side; there is particular reason to conclude that it did not come abroad into the world till after St. Hierome and St. Austin were dead: because they never take any notice of it, though it be aimed chiefly against them two without mentioning their names.

This book is not now extant: but an abstract of it is given by Photius<sup>b</sup>. If it be lawful to take a quotation at second hand from

<sup>y</sup> Apud Augustinum, Operis imperfecti contra Julian. lib. i. cap. 53.

<sup>z</sup> Subnotationum in Scripta Julian. cap. 8. [responsio 2. p. 53. edit. Garner.]

<sup>a</sup> M. Basnage, [in Histoire de l'Eglise, livr. viii. ch. 5. § 6. tom. i. p. 430. ed. Rotterdam, 1699.]

<sup>b</sup> Bibliotheca. Cod. 177.



any author, later than our period, it is from Photius: he was patriarch of Constantinople, anno 858, and the collections of <sup>758.</sup> (A.D. 858.) so learned and judicious a man are valued almost as much as if we had the originals.

The title of the book was, ‘Against them that say, men sin by nature and not by will.’ There are particular reflections plain enough upon the two Fathers I mentioned. But one of the opinions he there ascribes to his adversaries as an absurd one, is, ‘That infants, even when they are new born, are not without sin; because our nature being by Adam’s fall become sinful, that sinful nature is derived to all his posterity.’ And one of the arguments he makes them use to prove it, is this; ‘For what reason are the holy mysteries given to infants? Why are they accounted worthy of baptism [or proper to be baptized,] but because they are full of sin, sin being implanted in their nature? For it is for forgiveness that these things are done to them.’

The answer that he gives is, as Photius observes, the oddest that ever was given. He does not deny that they are baptized for forgiveness. But he says there is one sort of forgiveness which is for sins past: and another to procure a state for us in which we shall no more sin. And that is given, partly in this life, and ‘perfectly’ (as Photius recites his words) in that restauration which is to be ‘after the resurrection; for the obtaining of which both we, and also new-born infants, are baptized.’ He gave himself a great latitude in the use of words, to call that *forgiveness*.

I mention this man, only to shew that he, as well as the Pelagians of the west, took it for granted that infants are to be baptized, though he thought they have no sin. And even as for that opinion against original sin, (whatever he thought or kept in writing by him,) he found it necessary for him to join with the neighbouring bishops, in a synod held there, to condemn Julian and his opinions; as we understand by Mercator<sup>c</sup>.

XL. After this time, the Pelagian opinions being so universally condemned, none but some very few and very desperate persons did venture to declare for them, or against original sin. But a considerable number did still oppose another opinion that St. Austin held about particular prædestination. These were called by their adversaries Semi-pelagians, though they expressly renounced Pelagius as a heretic. And they called their adversaries Prædestinarians. But as to the matter we are treating of, they all agreed, that there

<sup>c</sup> Præfat. in Symbolum Theodori [Mopsuesteni, Op. tom. i. p. 95.]



is original sin in infants: that all baptized infants dying in infancy are saved: and, that no infant dying without baptism goes to heaven.

The difference between them, as to the case of infants that die in infancy, was this: St. Austin and his followers held, that God, by his mere gratuitous pleasure, does ordain that such or such infants shall come to have baptism, and so be saved, and others shall miss of it; without any regard had to the qualifications, which they would have had if they had lived.

But the Semi-pelagians (so called) said, that such infants as God foresaw would have been faithful Christians if they had lived, those he by his providence procured to be baptized: and suffered others to miss of it.

So both agreed, that in both cases, salvation attends baptism.

This appears at large in the works of Prosper, Fulgentius, Cassian, <sup>344.</sup> and others of each party; and in the latter works of St. <sup>(A. D. 444.)</sup> Austin himself, wherein he labours to expose his adversa- <sup>407.</sup> <sup>(A. D. 507.)</sup> ries' opinion as absurd; since God, who in Scripture is <sup>324.</sup> <sup>(A. D. 424.)</sup> said to judge every one according to what they have done, is brought in by these men, as judging infants by what they did not do, but would have done, if they had lived. And they answered, that this is more reasonable than to judge without any consideration at all.

He objects, that according to their hypothesis, it is to little purpose which is said in the Book of Wisdom<sup>d</sup>, of one that died young, *He was taken away, lest wickedness should alter his understanding, &c.*, if God will judge him according to what he would have done. To which they answer: that that is not canonical scripture: and he does not go about to maintain that it is<sup>e</sup>.

I shall have occasion to produce some of their sayings hereafter<sup>f</sup>, (where I give some account of the opinion of the ancients concerning the future state of infants dying unbaptized,) and therefore omit them here.

323. (A. D. 423.) In this dispute the popes and clergy of Rome  
332. (A. D. 432.) were generally zealous for the Prædestinarian side,  
340. (A. D. 440.) as Cælestine, Sixtus, Leo, Hormisdas, &c. The  
414. (A. D. 514.) other side found most abettors in France, especially about Marseilles.

<sup>d</sup> Ch. iv. 11.

<sup>e</sup> [See the epistle of Hilary to St. Austin, prefixed to Austin's treatise 'de Prædestinatione Sanctorum,' tom. x.

p. 519. and that treatise itself, cap. 14. sect. 28. tom. x. p. 534.]

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. ch. 6. § 4.

## CHAP. XX.

*Quotations out of St. Austin and Vincentius Victor.*

THERE were no need of quoting any more out of St. Austin, either of the doctrine that he held, or of the testimony that he gives of the churches' practice in his time or before; were it not that this Vincentius, saying some new things about the case of infants that had never been said before, gave occasion to St. Austin also, who answered him, to insist on some new proofs and defences of the catholic doctrine.

Vincentius seems to have been so inconsiderable a person, that his name would not have been remembered to the next generation, if he had not ventured to write against St. Austin; which now, by the books which that Father vouchsafed to write in answer to him, which are four books, intitled, 'Of the Soul and its Origin,' is likely to be spoken of as long as the world lasts.

He was a young layman, remarkable for two things, malapertness in judging and determining of controversial points; and a certain bombast in his style, which St. Austin<sup>b</sup>, out of his wonted civility and condescension, allows to be eloquent; and would make him believe, he might, if he would use his parts well, do God much service.

He was lately come off from the schism of the Donatists, which about this time mouldered away; but being of a restless head, could scarce keep clear of the heresy of the Pelagians, which had been (at the time when St. Austin wrote his first book against him) newly condemned. For so are St. Austin's words, 'Secundum Pelagianam hæresim, olim damnabilem, nuperrimeque damnatam<sup>i</sup>.' 'According to the Pelagian heresy, which always deserved condemnation, and is just now condemned.'

I take notice of this last circumstance, to set the time of this dispute right: for inasmuch as the year 418 was (as <sup>318.</sup> (A. D. 418.) bishop Ussher expresses it) the fatal year for the Pelagian heresy (for it was in that year that the canons of the forementioned great council of Carthage were published, on May the first; and the imperial edicts on April 30; and pope Zosimus' circular letter <sup>319.</sup> (A. D. 419.) a little after), this book of St. Austin's must probably have been written the latter end of that year, or the beginning of the next.

g [De Anima et ejus Origine, contra Vincentium Victorem, libri quatuor; contained in vol. x. of St. Austin's works,

ed. Benedict.]

<sup>h</sup> Lib. i. de Anima et ejus Origine, cap. ii. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. cap. 19.

I shall by and by make some use of this observation about the year, in explaining a passage which will give some light to this observation, and receive some from it.

II. Vincentius wrote two books, chiefly against that opinion (to which St. Austin inclined) that the soul is by propagation. He owned original sin<sup>k</sup>, which was the most material point in which he differed from the Pelagians. The soul, he said, is a corporeal substance<sup>l</sup>; and so is the spirit (which he took to be different from the soul): on which St. Austin observes, that according to him a man consists of three bodies. But he granted that God is of an incorporeal nature: on which St. Austin says, ‘I am glad that in that point however he keeps free from the dotages of Tertullian<sup>m</sup>.’ It is to be noted that Tertullian said, that God also is a body, or else he would be nothing at all.

When he came to speak of that question, whether the soul be propagated from the parent to the child, or be by immediate creation; he determined, that it is immediately created: and withal expressed a great contempt of the dulness and ignorance of those that did at all doubt or demur on that question. And he reflected on St. Austin particularly and by name, as one that had confessed his inability to resolve it, because of that objection; how it could consist with God’s justice to put a soul that is not derived from Adam, but is created pure, into the body of an infant, where it immediately contracts guilt and defilement.

We saw before<sup>n</sup> how much St. Austin was puzzled with this objection; and how St. Hierome, being desired by him, had refused to meddle with the solution of it. But now here Vincentius undertakes easily to answer it. But St. Austin shews that unless he could have brought a more skilful answer, he were better have demurred too; and ‘were better have confessed his ignorance than betrayed ‘his folly.’

The answer he had given was this:

I. First, in respect to such infants as do by God’s providence come to have baptism; that ‘they being by God’s præscience prædestinated to eternal life, it does them no hurt to continue a little ‘while under the guilt of another’s sin.’ That ‘as the soul contracts ‘a disease by sinful flesh, so sanctification [viz. that of baptism] is ‘likewise conveyed to it by means of the flesh; so that as by it the ‘soul lost its merit, [or innocence,] by it also it recovers its state<sup>o</sup>. ‘For shall we think that, because it is the body that is washed in

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. cap. 9.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. cap. 5.

<sup>m</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 5.

<sup>n</sup> Chap. xv. sect. 6, 7.

<sup>o</sup> Apud Augustin. lib. i. de Anima et ejus Origin. cap. 8.

‘baptism, that [benefit] which is believed to be given by baptism, is not conveyed to the soul or spirit? Fitly therefore it does by the flesh recover its former disposition, which by the flesh it had seemed for a while to have lost; that it may begin to be regenerated by that by which it had been defiled: so that though the soul, which could have no sin of its own, did deserve [or had the fate] to be made sinful; yet it did not continue in a state of sin,’ &c.

Against this answer St. Austin objects, that if we examine it strictly, it makes God first do an ill thing, in bringing an innocent soul into a sinful condition; and then make amends for it a little after by the grace of baptism. ‘Avertat autem Deus, et omnino absit, ut dicamus, quando lavacro regenerationis Deus mundat animas parvulorum, tunc eum mala sua corrigere,’ &c. ‘But God forbid, and far be it from us that we should say, that God, when he cleanses the souls of infants by the washing of regeneration, does then make amends for his own faults,’ &c. However, he says this is something; and may, after a fashion, serve for such infants as do come to be baptized. ‘De his quidem parvulis—invenit qualitercunque quod diceret,’ &c. ‘He has found something to answer after a fashion for such infants.’

But the chief difficulty is about those that miss of baptism; of whom we are to see in the next place what Vincentius said.

2. In reference to such as are never baptized, he, in his first book (for he wrote two, as I said) determined thus; ‘Habendam dicimus de infantibus istiusmodi rationem, qui prædestinati baptismo vitæ præsentis, antequam renascantur in Christo, præveniuntur occiduo,’ &c.—‘Ausim dicere istos pervenire posse ad originalium indulgentiam peccatorum; non tamen ut cœleste inducantur in regnum: sicuti latroni confesso quidem, sed non baptizato, Dominus non cœlorum regnum tribuit, sed paradisum; cum utique jam merneret,’ &c.

‘We must give some account of those infants, which being designed to be baptized in their lifetime, are, before they be regenerated in Christ, prevented with death.—I may venture to say that they may obtain forgiveness of their original sins; and yet not be admitted to the kingdom of heaven. As our Lord granted to the thief, that owned him and was not baptized, not the kingdom of heaven but *paradise*; that sentence being in force; *He that is not born again of water and the Holy Spirit, shall*

<sup>p</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 7.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. cap. 8.

<sup>r</sup> Lib. i. cap. 7.

<sup>s</sup> Lib. i. cap. 8.

<sup>t</sup> Apud August. lib. ii. de Anima, &c. cap. 9, 10.



‘not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Especially when our Lord says, that his Father has *many mansions*; by which are meant the many and different merits [or *rewards*] of those that shall dwell in them. So that there both the unbaptized may be admitted to pardon, and the baptized to the crown which is procured by grace.

‘For such infants indeed I give my opinion, that there be offered for them daily oblations, and continual sacrifices of holy priests. This I prove to be fitting to be done, by the example of the Maccabees<sup>u</sup> that fell in the battle<sup>x</sup>,’ &c.

On which determination of his, St. Austin, in the next words<sup>y</sup>, makes this remark, ‘Cernis hominem, paradisum atque mansiones quæ sunt apud Patrem, a regno separare cœlorum; ut etiam non baptizatis abundent loca sempiternæ felicitatis,’ &c. ‘You see how the man, that he may find places of eternal happiness for such as are not baptized, is fain to separate paradise, and the mansions in God’s house, from the kingdom of heaven.’

And a little after, ‘How can he hope that he himself shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, from which kingdom he excludes the house of the king himself to what distance he pleases?’ And in the third book written to Vincentius himself, he observes, ‘Christ does not say, as you cite his words, *My Father has many mansions*: and if he had said so, they could not be understood to be any where but in his Father’s house<sup>z</sup>. But he says expressly, *In my Father’s house are many mansions*<sup>a</sup>.’

And having a little after observed also that our Lord does not say, *If any one be not born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven*<sup>b</sup>: but, *he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*: he then concludes, ‘So I suppose you may by this time understand how wide from truth it is to separate any mansions in the *house of God* from the *kingdom of God*.’

To the instance that Vincentius gives of the thief who went to paradise, though not baptized, as he supposed; St. Austin answers, shewing how extraordinary his case was. That he, owning Christ at that time when they were putting both Christ and him to death, may well go for a martyr baptized in his own blood; that St. Cyprian reckons him as such; that moreover we are not sure but that he had been baptized, &c., and concludes, ‘Verum hæc ut volet quisque accipiat; dum tamen de baptismo non præscribatur Salvatoris præcepto, hujus latronis exemplo, et non baptizatis parvulis

<sup>u</sup> 2 Maccab. xii. 43.

<sup>x</sup> [Lib. i. cap. 11.]

<sup>a</sup> John xiv. 2.

<sup>y</sup> [Lib. i. cap. 10.]

<sup>b</sup> John iii. 3. 5.

<sup>z</sup> Cap. 11.

‘ nemo promittat inter damnationem regnumque cœlorum, quietis  
‘ vel felicitatis cujuslibet atque ubilibet quasi medium locum<sup>c</sup>.’

‘ But of these let every one take which he pleases; always pro-  
‘ vided that the example of this thief be not made use of for a  
‘ prescription against our Saviour’s rule concerning baptism: and  
‘ that no man do promise to unbaptized infants a place of rest and  
‘ happiness of any sort, or any where, as a kind of middle place  
‘ between condemnation and the kingdom of heaven.’

III. But Vincentius in his second book went further: for  
there having reassumed the instance of the thief, and of one  
Dinocrates<sup>d</sup>, (a boy that died at seven years old; and a sister  
of his that survived and suffered martyrdom, named Perpetua<sup>e</sup>,  
had, while she lay in prison, a dream or vision, wherein she saw  
him in a place of darkness and misery; and afterward, having  
prayed for his soul, she had another vision or dream, wherein she  
saw him in a place of happiness. This was recorded in a history

100. that was then 200 years old, and is still extant<sup>f</sup>,) he says  
(A.D. 200.) of the thief, and of this Dinocrates, (who he supposes  
died unbaptized, because born of heathen parents, as the story  
shews,) that they, for all their want of baptism, obtained paradise:  
and then adds, ‘ Or if any one do contend that the soul of the thief,  
‘ or of Dinocrates, were placed in paradise only for a time, and that  
‘ they shall have at the resurrection the reward of the kingdom of  
‘ heaven; although that principal sentence, *He that is not born again*  
‘ *of water, &c.* be against this; yet he shall have my willing assent,  
‘ if this do more set forth the effect of the divine mercy and pre-  
‘ science, and our love of themg.’ Shewing hereby, as St. Austin  
takes it, his opinion to be, that unbaptized infants also may, after  
staying some time in paradise, attain at the resurrection to the  
kingdom of heaven.

On which St. Austin says, ‘ Is it possible for any one to shew  
‘ greater boldness, rashness, presumption of error in this matter?  
‘ He remembers our Lord’s sentence, he repeats it, he sets it down  
‘ in his book; he says, “ Although that principal sentence, &c. be  
‘ against this:” and yet he dares exalt the neck [or pride] of his  
‘ own opinion against the principal sentence.——I entreat you,  
‘ brother, consider, whoever gives assent to any thing against the

<sup>c</sup> Lib. i. cap. 9.

<sup>d</sup> [Lib. ii. cap. 12.]

<sup>e</sup> [Lib. i. cap. 10.]

<sup>f</sup> Passio sanctæ Perpetuæ et Felicitatis.

[This was published by Lucas Holstenius.  
at Paris, in 1664: and is found, with ad-  
ditional remarks, in the *Acta Sanctorum*,

for the 7th day of March; and in Ruin-  
art’s ‘*Acta sincera Martyrum*,’ fol. Am-  
sterdam, 1713, p. 90, &c. See also the  
next page.]

‘ § Apud August. lib. ii. de Anima, &c.  
cap. 12.

‘ authority of the principal sentence, what sentence he deserves at the hands of the prince.’ And at another place, ‘ You do not consider how much worse you hold in this matter than Pelagius. For he, standing in awe of our Lord’s sentence, by which unbaptized persons are not permitted to enter the kingdom of heaven, does not dare send infants [viz. unbaptized ones] thither, though he think them free from all sin<sup>h</sup>.’

But St. Austin does here something stretch Vincentius’ words; for he does not speak this expressly of infants, but of the thief and Dinocrates; and of them but doubtfully.

As to Dinocrates, St. Austin answers<sup>i</sup>,

1. That the book, that tells this story, is no canonical book.

2. That Perpetua, or whosoever wrote it, does not say that he died unbaptized. For that being seven years old, he might have been baptized by the procurement of somebody else, or by his own choice, though his father were a heathen.

And he might have answered further, (as bishop Fell does<sup>k</sup>, to some papists that build the belief of purgatory, and the duty of

<sup>h</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 13.

<sup>i</sup> Lib. i. cap. 10.

<sup>k</sup> Notis in Passionem Perpetuæ, &c. edit. Oxon. 1680. [p. 14. These notes, which I have had some difficulty in tracing out, occur in an edition of the Passion of Perpetua, &c. appended to Lactantius’ treatise ‘de Mortibus Persecutorum,’ published by bishop Fell at Oxford, in the year 1680. It is remarkable, that none of the biographical dictionaries, nor Watt in his ‘Bibliotheca Britannica,’ nor even Antony à Wood, the diligent inquirer into all these matters, take any notice of such a work having been edited by the bishop: and perhaps it is also curious, considering all the circumstances of the work itself and of its editor, that no copy of it is found in the Bodleian Library.

Wood mentions, that Fell ‘published or reprinted every year while he was dean of Christ Church a book, commonly a classical author, against new-year’s tide, to distribute among the students of his house: to which books he either put an epistle, or running notes, or corrections. These,’ says he, ‘I have endeavoured to recover, that the titles might be known and here set down, but in vain.’ Athenæ Oxon. vol. iv. c. 198.

In all probability this Lactantius was one of the pieces alluded to. As it is of considerable rarity, I subjoin the title:

‘Lucii Cæli Firmiani Lactantii de Mortibus Persecutorum liber. Accesserunt passionēs SS. Perpetuæ et Felicitatis, S. Maximiliani, S. Felicis. Oxonii,

‘e theatro Sheldoniano, anno Dom. 1680.’ 120. pp. 1–108, and 1–56; with a separate preface to each part.

It was not the bishop’s custom to put his name to these annual publications; but it was sufficiently known at the time that he was editor. In the present instance he distinctly announces himself in the preface, which commences with the words, ‘Cum in Operum Cypriani et Lactantii editione quam adornamus—tardius procedatur,’ &c. He therefore resolves to publish the Lactantius *alone*: and accordingly it does not occur in his edition of Cyprian which appeared two years afterwards, nor is there any notice of it in the preface to that Father’s works.

The supplementary pieces of Perpetua, &c. are not reprinted in the second Oxford Lactantius, edited by Sparke in 1684, 8vo. nor in that published, with the collected notes of various editors, by Paulus Bauldri at Utrecht, in 1692; but in the preface to this last there is honourable mention of Fell’s edition; and although not named, he was certainly known to Bauldri, as its author. Walchius likewise, in his ‘Bibliotheca patristica,’ p. 149, cites this edition as appearing ‘cum brevibus scholiis Joann. Felli.’ Oxoniæ, 1680. 120.

I may add, that the Passion of Perpetua is corrected by the bishop from a manuscript in the Salisbury library, the various readings of which, together with his own terse notes, are appended to every page.]



praying souls out of it, on this story,) that here is no other evidence of Dinocrates being removed from torment to happiness, than a dream of Perpetua, who as the bishop shews by some circumstances, was probably a Montanist; and they were a sect that attributed more to their dreams and revelations than to the Scripture. Nor does any author before Vincentius quote this book, but Tertullian, who was himself a Montanist.

St. Austin shews also that Vincentius is the first that ever advised the prayers of the church to be used for any that had died unbaptized, or for any but church members. They had then, and so they had in Tertullian's and Cyprian's time<sup>1</sup>, a custom of commemorating, at the receiving of the eucharist, the names of the faithful deceased, and of making some general prayers for them, such as, 'God rest their souls, and grant them a happy resurrection:' but nothing like those prayers which the papists make for souls supposed to be in purgatory; nor did they use them for any but baptized and faithful Christians. Therefore, whereas Vincentius advises these prayers to be used as an after remedy for such infants as had died without being partakers of baptism; St. Austin on this account says, 'Do not believe, nor say, nor teach, that the sacrifice of Christians is to be offered for such as die unbaptized, if you will be a catholic. For neither do you shew that that sacrifice of the Jews which you mention out of the books of the Maccabees was offered for such as died uncircumcised. In which your opinion so new, and set up against the authority of the whole church<sup>m</sup>,' &c.

IV. I have recited these passages the larger, and in Vincentius' own words, because there has been lately a hot dispute between Colonel Danvers<sup>n</sup>, an antipædobaptist, on one side; and Mr. Baxter and

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. de Monogam. 'pro anima ejus orat, et refrigerium,' &c. [cap. 10.]

<sup>m</sup> De Anima, &c. lib. 3. cap. 12.

<sup>n</sup> [For some notice of Mr. Danvers, see pp. 133, 161. above. For the particulars of this dispute, and the opinions maintained by the several parties here mentioned, the reader is referred to the following pieces:

1. R. Baxter: (besides his other controversial tracts against Tombes and Bedford) 'Plain Scripture proof of Infants' Church-membership and Baptism.' 4to. 1651: again, 1656.

— 'More proofs of Infants' Church-membership, and consequently their right to baptism.' 8vo. 1675.

[See particularly this latter treatise written expressly against Tombes and Danvers, part ii. ch. 4. § 18.]

2. H. Danvers; 'A Treatise of Baptism,

wherein that of Believers, and that of Infants, is examined by the Scriptures. With the history of Christianity amongst the ancient Britains and Waldensians.' 8vo. 1674.

— 'Innocency and Truth vindicated: or a sober Reply to Mr. Wills' Answer to a late Treatise of Baptism.' 8vo. 1675.

— 'Second Reply,' &c. 8vo. 1676.

3. Obed Wills: 'Infant-Baptism asserted and vindicated by Scripture and antiquity, in Answer to a Treatise of Baptism lately published by Mr. Henry Danvers.' 8vo. 1674.

— 'Vindiciæ Vindiciarum; or a Vindication of the said Treatise,' &c. also 'An Appeal to the Baptists against Mr. Danvers for his strange Forgeries,' &c. 8vo. 1675.

— 'Censura Censuræ; or a just



Mr. Wills on the other; whether this Vincentius denied infant-baptism. You may judge by what I have rehearsed of Vincentius' own words, that the Colonel undertook a hard task. Yet he maintained his post a great while, referring the reader for proof <sup>1309.</sup> (A. D. 1409.) to Austin and Tho. Waldensis<sup>o</sup>, which latter lived but about 300 years ago. But his antagonists, searching and reciting the places to which he had referred, made it plain that neither of them had said any other thing of Vincentius' opinions than what is to the same purpose with that which I have here recited from himself. This had been enough to damp the courage of an ordinary man. But he, being thus home charged, and not used to yield, said at last, 'He denied it, as the denial of infant-baptism went in 'those days,' viz. 'that children might be saved without it.' The sense of which words, if they have any, is this: that nobody in those days denied infant-baptism any otherwise than by saying that children might be saved without it. Which is to yield the whole matter in dispute about the practice of those times, for fear of seeming to yield in one particular.

The truth of the matter is; that if we except Tertullian, (whose words I shewed before to be ambiguous and inconsistent,) this Vincentius is the first man upon record that ever said that children might be saved without baptism; if by being saved we mean going to heaven: for that many before him thought they would be in a state without punishment, I have shewed before.

V. Vincentius does not speak positively neither; and that which he did say, he, some time after he had received these books of St. Austin wrote against him, recanted. This St. Austin lets us know in the Review of his own works, written seven years after this time<sup>q</sup>. For there, speaking of these books which he had wrote in answer to Vincentius, he adds, 'Which young man I treated with all the 'mildness possible, as one that was not hastily to be detested; but 'to be as yet instructed; and I received from him writings in 'answer, containing his recantation.'

VI. Here is a proper place to say something of that clause, which I said even now<sup>r</sup> is found in some copies of the canons of the council of Carthage, anno 418, annexed as a part of the second canon. It is this:

<sup>o</sup> Censure of the unjust Sentence of the 'Baptists upon an Appeal made against 'Mr. H. Danvers.' 8vo. 1676.]

<sup>q</sup> [See 'Thomæ Waldensis, Anglici Carmelitæ, doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei 'Ecclesiæ Catholicæ,' 3 tom. fol. Venetiis,

1571. Especially the treatise 'De Sacramento Baptismi,' ch. 99. tom. ii. p. 164.]

<sup>p</sup> Second Reply, p. 37.

<sup>q</sup> Retractat. lib. ii. cap. 56. [Op. tom. i.]

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xix. § 37.

‘Item placuit, ut si quis dicit ideo dixisse Dominum, *In domo Patris mei mansiones multæ sunt*, ut intelligatur, quia in regno cælorum erit aliquis medius, aut ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate vivant parvuli, qui sine baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt; sine quo in regno [*l. regnum*] cælorum, quod est vita æterna, intrare non possunt, anathema sit.’

‘Also it has seemed good to us, that if any one affirm that our Lord did therefore say, *In my Father’s house are many mansions*; that it should be meant, that there will be in the kingdom of heaven any middle place, or any place any where, in which infants may live in blessedness that have died without baptism; without which they cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, (which is all one as eternal life,) he should be anathema.’

Most part of the copies have not, as I said before, this clause. But it is found in several. Mr. Du Pin mentions an old MS. that has it; and says that Photius cites it, [Cod. 53,] and that the Codex published by Quesnellus has it. Cardinal Noris quotes it, but thinks it spurious. And those antipædobaptists that examined Wills’ appeal against Danvers, say that they find it in the *Collectio Regia*, tom. iv. p. 559<sup>s</sup>. The critics have not, as I know of, given any account of this difference in the copies; of which I will here give my conjecture.

I believe the canon, as it was first enacted and published, (which was, as I shewed before, in the council in May 418,) had not this clause. But F. Garnier<sup>t</sup> and bishop Ussher before him<sup>u</sup> have plainly shewn that there was in June the next year, viz. 419, another council of the bishops of all the provinces of Africa, in which ‘the canons of the former council were read over and confirmed;’ and also (as bishop Ussher has it) ‘some peculiar matter against the Pelagian tenets enacted.’ He does not give any guess what that peculiar matter should be: but he proves that there was some such thing, partly from Prosper, and partly from this following passage of St.

<sup>s</sup> [It is indeed recited in the above place, but in smaller letters than the rest, with this introduction: ‘Quidam perve-  
tustus codex hoc loco hujusmodi caput insertum habebat: Item placuit,’ &c. Labbe’s edition does not notice this clause: but in that of Mansi, tom. iv. p. 504, we again find it, printed in smaller type, headed, ‘Nota ex Surio et Binio,’ (editors of the Councils in 1567 and 1606,) with a remark that it was found in that old MS. of canons which was published by Quesnel. —This may be seen in the second volume

of Pope Leo I.’s works by that editor: where, at cap. xiii. sect. 3. p. 75, the clause appears, as among canons passed at a full council holden at Carthage, against Pelagius and Cælestius, in the year 418. See too Quesnellus’ defence of the canon, in his ‘Dissertatio xiii. de Conciliis Africanis,’ *ibid.* tom. ii. p. 699.]

<sup>t</sup> Dissert. de Synodis in Causa Pelagiana [Diss. 2. cap. 16. apud Mercatoris Op. tom. i. p. 218.]

<sup>u</sup> Ecclesiæ Brit. Antiquit. cap. 10. prope finem.

Austin in his letter to Valentinus; ‘What was written to pope Zosimus from the African council; and his letter to the bishops of all the world; and what he did, in the following plenary council of all Africa, enact in short against that error\*.’ That plenary council, which he calls the *following one*, and places after Zosimus’ letter, must have been in 419; since I shewed before, that that letter was after the council in 418.

I also shewed before, at § 1, that this new fancy of Vincentius was published and canvassed in the time that passed between those two councils, viz. in the latter end of the year 418, or in the beginning of the year 419. And it was published in Mauritania Cæsariensis, one of the African provinces: for there Vincentius lived, as St. Austin tells us†. And it had some followers; for he speaks of one Peter, a presbyter, that among others embraced it.

I believe then, that the canon of 418 had only so much as is in the ordinary copies; but that the bishops, meeting in 419, and understanding that this opinion had been, since their last meeting, vented in one of their provinces, to support by a new salvo the Pelagian hypothesis; they then added to the second canon, which spoke of the case of infants, this clause.

My chief reason is, because this addition recites the very words of Vincentius, and does condemn them in almost the same words which St. Austin had used in the confutation of them: as will appear to any one that will turn back to § 2, 3. And the fancy was so new and uncouth, that no council could have thought of it, but on such a particular occasion.

And I believe the reason why most copies of that council do now want this clause is,

1. Because the canon having been first published without it, many copies went abroad before that appendix was added. And,

2. Because the modern church of Rome has set up an hypothesis so like this of Vincentius, and their *limbus infantum* does so nearly resemble his *feigned paradise*, being as that was, a kind of *middle place*; that those of that church, who had the transcribing of copies, did not like well of an anathema denounced against such an opinion.

\* Epist. 47. [215. ed. Benedict, sect. 2, where see the editor’s note.]

† Retractat. lib. ii. cap. 56.



## CHAP. XXI.

*Irenæus, Epiphanius, Philastrinus, St. Austin, and Theodoret, who wrote each of them catalogues of all the sects and sorts of Christians that they knew or had ever heard of, do none of them mention any that denied infant-baptism, except those who denied all baptism.*

§ I. THE Christians have always been of two sorts, viz. catholics, who, though they inhabited several countries, yet did all  
 67—330. (A. D.) own communion one with another, and so made one ca-  
 167—430.) tholic body, or church; and sectaries, or heretics, who renounced the catholic body aforesaid, and separated into several parties on account of some tenets, opinions, or practices in religion, which they held different from the catholic church; or sometimes merely on account of some quarrel with the governors thereof. The church of Christ never was, nor ever in this world will be, so happy as to be without such sects and divisions. But woe be to the men by whom they come.

The quotations hitherto produced do concern the practice of the catholics in this matter of infant-baptism; saving that here and there by the by there has been mention made of the tenets of some of the heretics or schismatics. As of the Donatists, chap. ix. § 1; chap. xv. sect. 4. § 4; chap. xvi. § 1, 2: and of the Arians, chap. xii. § 9, 10: and of the Pelagians, chap. xix. *per totum*: of all whom it appears that they practised infant-baptism, as the catholics did; and that without any difference of opinion concerning the use or effect of it; save that the Pelagians held that it was not for the cure of original sin, but for other purposes. Also we saw in the said chap. xix. the several declarations of St. Austin, at § 17, pleading that he had never heard, and of Pelagius at § 30, granting that he also had never heard of any sect or sort of Christians that denied infant-baptism. And that which they two do say there in general, I find to be agreeable to the account that is given by all the rest that write histories of the several sects in particular, viz. that among all that vast number of sects, and their several opinions which they recite, they mention none that denied baptism to infants.

They do indeed each of them mention some sects that used no baptism at all; of which sects I do give a catalogue in the second part of this work.<sup>z</sup> St. Austin observes they were all of them such



as disowned also the scripture, or a great part thereof. But my meaning is, that of all the sects that owned any water-baptism at all, they mentioned none that denied it to infants.

Now since they do all of them make it their business to rehearse all the tenets, opinions, and usages, which these men held different from the catholic party, and yet do mention no difference in this particular; one may conclude that they all of them practised in this particular as the catholics did. If the catholics had not baptized infants, and the sectaries had; it would have been noted. And if the catholics did baptize them, and the sects had not; that also would have been noted. For they recite all that each sect had singular. And they mention differences of much less moment than this would have been. Now what evidence there is of the practice of the catholics in this matter, must be left to be judged by him that has read the foregoing chapters: for the authors cited in them were all members of the catholic church, save that Tertullian afterward revolted from it, and Pelagius with his followers were excommunicated out of it.

II. The first treatise concerning sects or heresies, that is extant, was written by Irenæus. He, about twenty years after St. John's <sup>20.</sup> death, was a hearer of Polycarp (St. John's disciple and <sup>(A. D. 120.)</sup> acquaintance) at Smyrna; and about forty-seven years <sup>67.</sup> (A. D. 167.) after that, was made bishop of Lyons in France: so that, having lived and conversed in such distant countries, and with such men, he had an opportunity of knowing what sects there were or had been. He wrote this tract about the year after the apostle's death 76 or 77. as I shewed before in chap. iii. § 6. He mentions the sects that arose in the time of the apostles, and those that had sprung up in the seventy-six years that had passed since their death.

They were all of them but a few in comparison of the number that arose afterward; but a great many considering the time that had then passed. He takes most pains in refuting the Valentinians; who, it seems, were most numerous at that time and place. But he says himself that his purpose was to rehearse all that were, or had been; which was easy to do for so short a space.

After much discourse against the Valentinians, he goes to prove that they derived their opinions, not from Christ or his apostles; but from the former heretics which had in the apostles' time set themselves against the apostles. These are his words:

‘ Since then that there is manifold evidence against all the sects; and that my purpose is to confute each of them according to their

‘several tenets; I think it proper in the first place to recount from ‘what fountain and original they sprung<sup>a</sup>.’

Then he declares how Simon the magician, mentioned by St. Luke<sup>b</sup>, was the first, who, after he was rejected by the apostles, set up a sect; and taught that this world was made, not by the good and supreme God, but by inferior and evil powers: and proceeds in the following chapters to shew that this impious tenet made a main part in the doctrine, not only of the Valentinians, against whom he was principally engaged; but also of most of those elder ones that had followed Simon’s example in setting up sects. For the same thing was taught by Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Cerdo, and Marcion, as well as by Valentinus. And so it was, after Irenæus’ time, by Manes and the Manichees.

Of these heretics mentioned by him, the first two, Simon and Menander, do seem to have endeavoured to obliterate the memory of Jesus Christ. For each of them pretended himself to be *that great power of God* [viz. of the supreme God] that was to redeem men from the malice and tyranny of that angel, or inferior god, that made the world, and gave the law.

The two next, Saturninus and Basilides, owned Jesus Christ that came in Judæa: but they owned only his divine nature<sup>d</sup>. For they said he was not really a man, nor did really die, but only in appearance.

The two next, Carpocrates and Cerinthus<sup>e</sup>, owned him to be a man and a saviour; but not to be God, nor to have had any being before his human birth. Only they said, a divine power from the Supreme God came down at a certain time upon him, and dwelt in him, which enabled him to do what he did. This last opinion is now going to be revived.

All these three branches of heresy arose while St. John was alive: and so did the Ebionites and Nicolaitans, which he mentions likewise<sup>f</sup>. These did not join in the foresaid blasphemy against the Creator of the world. But had other abominable tenets. The Nicolaitans, chiefly in reference to practice: allowing fornication, &c. And the Ebionites in point of faith: disbelieving the divinity of our Saviour, (as the Cerinthians and Carpocratians,) and renouncing and railing at the apostle Paul, and all his writings; which do now make one half, and at that time made the much greatest

<sup>a</sup> Lib. i. cap. 19. [cap. 22. sect. 2. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>b</sup> Acts viii. 9.

<sup>c</sup> Irenæus, lib. i. cap. 20, 21. [cap. 23.]

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. cap. 22, 23. [cap. 24.]

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. cap. 24, 25. [cap. 25, 26.]

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. cap. 26, 27. [cap. 26.]

part of the scriptures of the New Testament: for St. John had not written when they set up their sect. This would make one stand amazed at the impiety of those men nowadays, that calling themselves Christians, would yet persuade us that these Ebionites were the true Christians of those times; that they were the orthodox; and those whom we call catholics, were erroneous. The tendency of such a tenet is to persuade us, together with the doctrine of Christ's divinity, to renounce also half the books of the New Testament. As St. John lived to see all these heresies vented; so one may perceive that he at several places of his writings opposed himself to such opinions.

Of sects that had arisen after the death of the apostles, he mentions the Enekratites, the Caians, the sects of Cerdo, of Marcion, and of Valentinus. The last four of these were an offspring of those first mentioned, (who were by a general name called Gnostics,) and did all agree with them in the point afore mentioned, that the Maker of heaven and earth is not the supreme God; but that there is another far above him: and that it was that upper one that sent the Saviour.

It was in opposition to this sort of heretics, that the catholic church found it necessary to insert that clause, *THE MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH*, into the first article of the creed. For the most ancient creeds had no more in that article than, 'I believe in God the Father Almighty.' The eastern church, where those heresies were most rife, inserted it first; and the Latins from them. The Latins had it not in their creed at the year 400. Without that clause, the Manichees, Gnostics, &c., would say, they believed in God the Father Almighty; but would mean a quite different God from him whom the Christians owned: who always meant the Creator of the world, and author of the Old Testament, to be the same with the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It pleased God by his providence so to order it; that though some heresies were very ancient, yet they are all so absurd, that they can tempt no man of ordinary sincerity that reads the scriptures.

The points concerning baptism, in which Irenæus notes any of the said sects to have held any thing singular, are these:

Menander promised<sup>h</sup> that all that would be baptized with his baptism, [or baptism in his name,] should presently have a resurrection: and after that should never die nor grow old, but be immortal. Whereupon Tertullian, about 100 years after Menander's

<sup>g</sup> Iren. lib. i. cap. 28, 29, 30, 35. [cap. 27, 28, 31.]    <sup>h</sup> Iren. lib. i. cap. 21. [cap. 23.]



death, challenges<sup>i</sup> that sect to produce any of their fellows that had been baptized by Menander himself, that was yet alive.

The Carpocratians ear-marked their proselytes. And that, as I understand Irenæus<sup>k</sup>, went for their baptism. 'They burned a hole in the hinder part of the lap of the right ear.' Here let me add a few of the next words, though not to this purpose. 'They call themselves Gnostics, [i. e. the men of knowledge;] they use also certain images, some painted, and some carved; and say, they are pictures of Christ drawn by Pilate, while Jesus lived among men. On these they put garlands, and set them up together with the images of the philosophers of the world, as Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, &c. And they use all such ceremonies to them as the heathen do.' These men, and some people at Paneas, mentioned by Eusebius<sup>l</sup> to have had the like heathenish fancy, as he calls it, are the 'first authors of the worship of Christ by an image that are any where mentioned.' Epiphanius also mentions the ear-marks used by the Carpocratians, Hær. 27.

The Valentinians had several under-sects, of which Irenæus speaks particularly. And for their baptism, he says<sup>m</sup> they had as many sorts of it as there were teachers among them; but all contrary to the true. Some instead of baptism dressed up a marriage-bed, and with certain profane words acted a marriage of the person to Christ. Others put the person into the water indeed, but instead of the Christian form of baptism used a strange and uncouth one, which I have occasion to repeat at another place<sup>n</sup>, and anointed the baptized person with balsam. 'There are some of them,' says Irenæus, 'who think it needless to bring the person to the water at all; but mixing oil and water together they pour it on his head, [by which words of his, and by a thousand other instances, it appears that the catholics did ordinarily put the whole body in the water,] and they use certain words not much different from those I mentioned before; and they will have this to be redemption, [or baptism,] and these also use balsam.' Others of them used no water at all, nor other external ceremonies; but said: 'spiritual baptism, which consists in the knowledge of the unspeakable Majesty, is all in all.'

III. Some of them did pour oil and water on the heads of people newly dead, with such words and imprecations as he had before mentioned; and they told the dead man's soul what it should say,

<sup>i</sup> De Anima, cap. 50.

<sup>k</sup> Lib. i. cap. 24. [cap. 25.]

Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. cap. 18.

<sup>m</sup> Lib. i. cap. 18. [cap. 21.]

<sup>n</sup> Part ii. chap. v. § 1.



if in its way to the supreme heaven, it should meet with any of the principalities or powers that belong to him that made this world. The soul was to say, 'that it was better than the power that made ' them.' And a great deal more such blasphemous stuff.

Irenæus excuses himself from descending to more particularities; for that they inventing every day new ways and opinions, it was endless to describe them all.

As to the Cerinthians and Marcionists, he is very short, and says nothing about their baptism. But Epiphanius<sup>o</sup> speaks of a tradition that the Cerinthians did use to baptize some living person in the stead of any friend of theirs that had happened to die unbaptized: and that it was in relation to such a practice that the apostle says<sup>p</sup>, *If there be no resurrection of the dead, why are they then baptized for the dead?* And St. Chrysostom, in his explication of that text, says, that the Marcionists did the same. And Tertullian in his fifth book against Marcion<sup>q</sup>, speaks of that custom, and the apostle's mentioning of it; but shews that his mentioning of it is no evidence that he approved it. The Comments ascribed to St. Ambrose do also so interpret the place.

There are two objections against that interpretation.

1. One is, that the Marcionists for certain, and probably the Cerinthians, were not in being when that apostle wrote. Cerinthus had a party before St. John's death; but this epistle of St. Paul was a long time before that.

Therefore Scaliger and others think that some zealous but ignorant people among the catholics had upon a sense of the necessity of baptism begun this custom in St. Paul's time: and that in the catholic church it was quickly left off; but that it was continued afterward among the Cerinthians and Marcionists.

2. The other is, that St. Paul would not probably draw an argument for the resurrection of the dead from so weak a topic as the practice either of abominable heretics or mistaken Christians.

But these men do not seem to have minded that St. Paul does sometimes take in the suffrages even of heathen men in his arguings. He might reasonably enough propose to himself to shame those among the Christians at Corinth that did not believe the resurrection, by instancing in the general assent that was given to that article among all Christians: and even among those who, how much soever they might be mistaken in thinking that that vicarious baptism would avail the dead, yet did plainly shew that they fully

<sup>o</sup> Hæc. 28. [cap. 6. tom. i. p. 114.]

<sup>p</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 29.

<sup>q</sup> Cap. 10.

believed the resurrection of the dead, when they practised this sort of baptism for them.

This interpretation is certainly the most obvious. And it is something confirmed by the ill success of those that have attempted any other. That 'baptized for the dead' should stand instead of 'baptized for their bodies'. Or, that 'for the dead,' should be construed, 'for the state of the deads'; or, 'for their dead Adam'; or, 'why are they baptized for the dead?' i. e. why are persons ready to die desirous of baptism 'that it may be well with them after they are dead' ? Or, that *ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν* should be translated, 'over the dead,' i. e. why do people choose to receive their baptism at the tombs of dead martyrs? Or, 'that baptized for the dead,' should mean nothing but 'washed after the touch of a dead body.' These are the essays of learned men. But the more one observes the apostle's phrase, the less probable they appear.

The latest that has been given, is, I think, the worst; 'why are they baptized for the dead?' that is, 'why are new Christians baptized every day in the room of those that die?' For that fits neither the phrase nor the scope of the place.

*ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν* for *ὑπὲρ τὴν τῶν νεκρῶν ἀνδραστῶν*<sup>a</sup> 'upon the faith of the resurrection of the dead,' would fit the sense very well: but it is a great stretch of the words. 'Baptized for the dead, i. e. buried under water for dead,' or, as if they were dead<sup>b</sup>, is a mere Anglicism; that would never in Greek have been expressed *ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν*, but *ὡσεὶ νεκροί*.

St. Chrysostom's objection<sup>c</sup> against this sense of the place, that St. Paul should refer to such a custom among some Christians, is this; 'If Paul meant so, to what purpose is the threatening of God against one that is not baptized? For if this shift [viz. of a living person to be baptized for one that is dead] be admitted, none will ever miss of baptism; or, if he do, it will be the fault of those that survive, and not of the dead person.' But St. Chrysostom does not seem to have considered that (as Tertullian says) the apostle might mention this custom without approving it. Though a mistaken practice, yet it shewed still the faith of the resurrection.

The Marcionists had also several other singular opinions about

<sup>r</sup> Tertullian. contra Marcion. lib. v. cap. 10.

<sup>s</sup> Chrysost. in loc. [Homil. 40. Op. tom. x. p. 378.]

<sup>t</sup> Vossius de Baptismo, Disp. 12. cap. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Epiphani. Hær. 28.—cap. 6.

<sup>x</sup> Prudent. Hymn. 8. [De loco in quo

martyres passi sunt, nunc baptisterium dicitur.]

<sup>y</sup> Vasquez in tertiam part. Thomæ Aquin. Disp. 157.

<sup>z</sup> Mr. Le Clerc. Annot. in loc.

<sup>a</sup> Hammond. in loc.

<sup>b</sup> Sir Norton Knatchbull.

<sup>c</sup> In loc. [Homil. 40. § 1.]

baptism. They would baptize no married person till he did divorce his wife: for they said that marriage and all the works thereof were wicked things, and were ordered by that evil god or angel that gave the law, and made mankind. Hence Tertullian jeers them<sup>d</sup>, saying, that they ‘reserved a man’s baptism till he was divorced or dead.’

What Irenæus here says of one sort of the Valentinians, that they baptized some persons after they were dead, Philastrius sayse, was the common tenet of the Montanists or Cataphryges. ‘Hi mortuos ‘baptizant.’ These baptize people after they are dead. There were also here and there some in the catholic church, who through a mistaken zeal and compassion to persons that died unbaptized, would sometimes do the same. For there is a canon in the third council of Carthage against that practice. That council allows sick people to be baptized though they be speechless, if there be good evidence of their fitness and desire of it<sup>f</sup>. But yet they sayg, ‘Let not any ‘priests be so ignorant as to think that dead persons may be baptized.’

Inasmuch as Irenæus, among all these observations, says nothing *pro* or *contra* about baptizing infants among the heretics; it may, as I said, be concluded that they had nothing singular in that point, but practised as the catholics did. And for the catholics, I produced before<sup>h</sup> the saying of Irenæus himself, where he speaks of infants being, as well as grown persons, the ordinary subject of regeneration. And that by *regenerated*, he and all the ancients did understand *baptized*, whatever pains might be necessary to shew it then in that chapter, I suppose there is none needful now: because the reader has since that seen that all the authors do speak in that language.

IV. The other four, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Austin, and Theodoret, were all living at one time; only Epiphanius was<sup>From 265 to 350.</sup> the eldest, and Theodoret the youngest. I shall not with these take the same pains as I did with Irenæus, of setting down all the customs or tenets that they recount the several sects to have held different from the catholics, in the matter of baptism: it would be too voluminous. It is sufficient that they do none of them mention any thing concerning infant-baptism either as practised or as not practised by any of the sectaries, (a plain proof that they held nothing in that point different from the ordinary practice of the church,) save that St. Austin notes of the Pelagians, (which is in his

<sup>d</sup> Contra Marcionem, lib. iv. cap. 11.

<sup>e</sup> Hæres. Cataphrygum [cap. 49. p. 103. edit. Fabricii, 120. 1721. Fabricius refers to Dr. Wall’s notice of this passage, in his note.]

<sup>f</sup> [Concil. Carth. iii. anno Christi 397. apud Labb. ii. p. 1167, &c.] Canon 34.

<sup>g</sup> Canon 6.

<sup>h</sup> Chap. iii. § 2.



account the eighty-seventh and last heresy that had risen,) that though they agreed with the church that infants are to be baptized, yet they held a different opinion concerning the ground or reason of their baptism. His words are these<sup>i</sup>; ‘Parvulos etiam negant, secundum Adam carnaliter natos, contagium mortis antiquæ primæ nativitate contrahere. Sic enim eos sine ullo peccati originalis vinculo asserunt nasci, ut prorsus non sit quod eis oporteat secundæ nativitate dimitti: sed eos propterea baptizari, ut regeneratione adoptati admittantur ad regnum Dei, &c.’

‘They do also deny that infants which are descended from Adam according to the flesh, do, by their first birth, contract any contagion of the anciently threatened death, (for they affirm them to be born without any bond of original sin;) so that there is nothing in them that needs to be forgiven by the second birth; but that they are baptized for that reason, that being by this regeneration adopted, they may be admitted to God’s kingdom; being by this renewal advanced from a good state to a better, but not absolved from any ill state of the old obligation. For, though they be not baptized, these men do promise them a certain eternal and happy life; not in the kingdom of God indeed, but of a peculiar sort.’

This was the only sect that he knew of, he says<sup>k</sup>, that denied infant-baptism to be for original sin. And for any that denied it absolutely, he knew of none at all.

Mr. Tombes, being to answer Mr. Marshall<sup>l</sup>, who had produced a great many of the Fathers that speak of infants as baptized, makes this exception; that there are several others of them that have nothing at all of that matter. ‘It is wonder to me,’ says he<sup>m</sup>, ‘that if it were so manifest as you speak, you should find nothing in Eusebius for it, nor in Ignatius, nor in Clemens Alexandrinus, nor in Athanasius, nor in Epiphanius.’

The objection is but weak. For there is no age of the church in which one may not find many books that say nothing of that matter; because they treat of subjects on which they have no occasion to speak of that. Ignatius wrote nothing but a few letters to the neighbouring churches, to exhort them to constancy in that time of persecution. Athanasius was wholly taken up about the Trinity. Clemens Alexandrinus with the heathen philosophers; (yet in him we have now found a place where he in a transient and cursory way mentions the apostles baptizing infants.) Eusebius writes the chro-

<sup>i</sup> Lib. de Hæresibus, cap. 87. [Op. tom. viii. p. 20.]

<sup>k</sup> See chap. xix. § 17.

<sup>l</sup> [See Stephen Marshall’s Sermon on

Infant Baptism, 4<sup>o</sup>. 1644: and his Defence of Infant-Baptism in answer to Mr. Tombes, 4<sup>o</sup>. 1648.]

<sup>m</sup> Examen, p. 9. 4<sup>o</sup>. 1645.



nicles of the succession of kings, emperors, bishops, and the state of the church, either flourishing or persecuted, under each of them.

But I think Mr. Tombes could not well have said a more unlucky thing for his own cause, than to instance in Epiphanius. For since he wrote nothing to speak of, but a catalogue of those opinions which the several sectaries held contrary to the church; to plead that he says nothing of infants' baptism, is in effect to give an argument that there never was any sect that in that matter practised otherwise <sup>300.</sup> than the church did in Epiphanius' time, who died after (A. D. 400.) the year 400. And that the church at that time used infant-baptism is so plain, that the antipædobaptists do seldom deny it.

V. But Mr. Tombes gives an instance of a case in which he thinks it would have been proper for Epiphanius to have mentioned infant-baptism, if it had then been in universal use in the church. For Epiphanius gives an account<sup>n</sup> of a sect, that had begun about 100 years before, called the Hieracites; who taught that no infant dying before the use of reason could come to the kingdom of heaven. Their reason was, *If any one strive, he is not crowned, except he strive lawfully*<sup>o</sup>. 'How much less can an infant be crowned who never strives at all?' They thought of the kingdom of God in heaven, as the antipædobaptists do of his kingdom on earth, that it is no state for babes. Now Mr. Tombes thinks that Epiphanius, among the arguments he brings that infants may be glorified, would have pleaded their baptism, if the baptizing them had been usual in the church.

But he seems not to have considered, that heretics and schismatics do not use to be prevailed on by arguments drawn from the practice or doctrines of the church. And as for arguments from scripture, Epiphanius uses those that do more expressly and immediately prove their admission into the kingdom of God; as that saying of our Saviour, *Of such is the kingdom of God*, &c., and is but short in all.

It might be objected again, that in all probability these heretics did not baptize their own children. If they did, it could be only in prospect of some benefit it might do them afterward, if they lived. And if they did not baptize them; it had been proper for Epiphanius to mention that, as a thing wherein they differed from the catholics, supposing that the catholics did baptize theirs.

But upon a more careful reading of their opinions there rehearsed, it appears that they could have no children. For one of their tenets was, that all marriage and getting of children is unlawful under the

<sup>n</sup> Hæres. 67. [cap. 2.—Op. tom. i. p. 711.]

<sup>o</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 5.

New Testament; and that ‘no married person can inherit the kingdom of God. That the only end of Christ’s coming was to settle an absolute continence. For what new thing did he bring into the world else? Against malice, covetousness, injustice, fornication, &c., the law had well enough provided before.’

Whether these men would have baptized their children if they had had any, is uncertain. But the first body of men we read of, that did deny baptism to infants, which were the Petrobrusians, anno 1050. Dom. 1150, did it upon a ground or reason which they (A.D. 1150.) held common with these men, viz. that infants baptized or not baptized, are incapable of the kingdom of heaven; as I shew in the Second Part of this work, chap. vii. § 5.

Epiphanius reckons in all eighty heresies, which, he says<sup>p</sup>, ‘were all that he heard of in the world.’ He says nothing of (A.D. 374.) their baptizing or not baptizing infants. But in the end of his work he recites the faith held by the church, in opposition to all heresies. In settling the articles of faith he is large; but he has also a few words concerning the rites of the church. He mentions the fasts and feasts, &c., and he adds, ‘as for the other ordinances concerning baptism and the internal mysteries; as the tradition of the gospel and of the apostles is, so they are ordered.’ And after some mention of the manner how the catholic church uses the prayers, psalms, ways of relieving the poor, &c.; he adds, ‘and for baptism, she [the catholic church] accounts it to be in Christ [or to the Christians] instead of the old circumcision<sup>q</sup>.’ The like he says in his eighth chapter, which is of the Epicureans; ‘the law had the patterns of things in it; but the truth of them is in the gospel. The law had the circumcision in the flesh, serving for a time, till the great circumcision came, that is, baptism; which circumcises us from our sins, and seals us unto the name of God<sup>r</sup>.’

Philastrius makes above 100 heresies. He makes a difference in opinion about any trifling matter to be a heresy. He (A.D. 380.) mentions no dispute about infant-baptism.

Theodoret has wrote in the best method about heresies<sup>s</sup>. He has reduced them to some general heads. He makes four. (A.D. 430.) The first, of those beforementioned and such others as have denied that the world was made by God. The second, of those that have attributed to our Saviour no other nature than the human.

<sup>p</sup> Hær. 80. [cap. 10. tom. i. p. 1076.]

<sup>q</sup> [See Epiphaniï Expositio Fidei Catholicæ, cap. 22, et 24.—Op. tom. i. p. 1106, 1107.]

<sup>r</sup> [Lib. i. cap. 8. § 6.—Op. tom. i. p. 19.]

<sup>s</sup> [See his Hæreticarum Fabularum Compendium, (introduction,) in vol. iv. p. 187. of his works, published by Sirmondus, fol. 1642.)

The other two, of other sects. He says the first sort had at that time hardly any that adhered to them: and the second sort, none at all. He mentions some sects that used no baptism at all. But it was only some of the most absurd and impious. But of those that used baptism, he has none that renounced infant-baptism. After the four books of these four sorts of heresies, he adds a fifth; which is, 'Of the True and Orthodox Doctrines and Usages of the Church.' He mentions there the baptism of infants, not as a thing disputed of, or denied by any sect: but occasionally. Shewing the advantages of baptism, that it conveys not only pardon for the sins of men's former life, but many other graces; he proves it by the baptism of infants, who have committed no sin. The words I had occasion to recite before<sup>t</sup>. There is another catalogue of heresies at the end of *Tertullian de Præscriptione*. But it hath nothing about baptism; save that Menander said, none could be saved, that were not baptized in his name.

---

## CHAP. XXII.

*Containing References to the Books of some Authors of the next succeeding Times.*

§ I. THIS is the best account I can give of the passages concerning infant-baptism that are in the genuine books of <sup>300—400.</sup> the writers that flourished from the apostles' time to the <sup>(A.D.)</sup> year of Christ 400. The reason that I go no further is, <sup>400—500.</sup> because for the next 700 years the matter is clear. Yet of those <sup>1050.</sup> years and of the Waldenses that arose about the year 1150, <sup>(A.D. 1150.)</sup> I intend to discourse something in general, in the Second Part of this work<sup>a</sup>.

And here, for the sake of those that have any mind to trace the quotations for about one hundred years further, I have set down some references to the places where they are to be found. To set down the words is too long; they being all to the same effect with those already rehearsed.

Prosper<sup>b</sup>, in almost all his works against the Pelagian and Semi-pelagian tenets, makes use of the argument taken from <sup>344.</sup> the necessity of the baptizing of infants. Particularly, <sup>(A.D. 444.)</sup>

<sup>t</sup> Ch. xiv. § 4.

<sup>a</sup> Part ii. ch. 7.

<sup>b</sup> [See *Prosperi Opera*, ab Olivario edita, fol. Paris, 1671. Some of these pieces are

printed in the Appendix to vol. x. of the Benedictine edition of Augustine's works. Also in *Cassiani Opera*, fol. 1628. p. 887, &c.]

*Epist. ad Augustinum*, prefixed to St. Austin's book *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum*. [Op. tom. x.]

*Epist. ad Demetriadem*, among the works of St. Ambrose.

*De Vocatione Gentium*, lib. i. c. 16, 22. lib. ii. c. 20, 21, 22, 23, &c. I know it is questioned whether this be Prosper's, or pope Leo's, or some other man's work; but it is much one to this purpose, since whoever he were, he lived about this time.

Carmen de Ingratis, cap. 1, 6, 21, 30, 31, &c.

Contra Collatorem.

Epist. ad Rufinum, *circa medium*.

Defensio Augustini.

316<sup>c</sup> (A.D. 416.) Orosius Apologetic.

320<sup>d</sup> (A.D. 420.) Paulinus Diaconus, Libello ad Zosimum Papam.

330<sup>e</sup>. (A.D. 430.) Hilarius Arelatensis, Epist. ad Augustinum.

318<sup>f</sup>. (A.D. 418.) Marius Mercator, Commonitorii, cap. 1, & 4.

Præfatione ad Subnotationes.

Subnotat. cap. 6. item 8.

323<sup>g</sup>. (A.D. 423.) Cælestinus Papa, Epist. ad Maximian. apud Acta Concilii Ephesini.

Epist. ad Gallos Episcopos.

331<sup>h</sup>. (A.D. 431.) Epistola Synodica Concilii Ephesini ad Cælestinum Papam.

235<sup>i</sup>. (A.D. 435.) Auctor Prædestinati, a Sirmondo editus, Paris. 1643.

330<sup>k</sup>. (A.D. 430.) Possidius in vita Augustini.

330<sup>l</sup>. (A.D. 430.) Auctor Hypognoticōν, inter Opera Augustini, lib. iv. v. et passim.

312<sup>m</sup>. (A.D. 412.) Isidorus Pelusiota, lib. i. epist. 125. lib. iii. epist. 195, &c.

324<sup>n</sup>. (A.D. 424.) Cassianus, de Incarnatione Domini, lib. v. c. 11.

312<sup>o</sup>. (A.D. 412.) Cyrillus in Levitic. c. 8.

<sup>c</sup> [Pauli Orosii adversus Paganos Historiæ, ut et Apologeticus contra Pelagium de Arbitrii Libertate,—cura S. Haverkampii, 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1738. It is reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, by Gallandi, tom. ix.]

<sup>d</sup> [See this in the Collection of Councils; edit. Labbe, vol. ii. p. 1578. edit. Mansi, tom. iv. p. 381.]

<sup>e</sup> [See these among St. Austin's epistles, No. 156, and 226, tom. ii. p. 414, and 626.]

<sup>f</sup> [M. Mercatoris opera, cura Garnerii, 2 tom. fol. Paris. 1673. cura Baluzii, 8vo. Paris, 1684; and in the Bibliotheca Patrum by Gallandi, tom. viii.]

<sup>g</sup> [See these, in the Collection of Councils, edit. Labbe, vol. ii. p. 1618, 1630. edit. Mansi, vol. iv. p. 464. vol. v. p. 271.]

<sup>h</sup> [See Councils; edit. Labbe, vol. v. p. 660. edit. Mansi, iv. p. 1329.]

<sup>i</sup> [And reprinted in the first volume of Sirmondus' Works, fol. Paris, 1696. p. 449. Also in the Bibliotheca Patrum, by Gallandi, tom. x.]

<sup>k</sup> [This is printed in the Appendix to the 10th volume of St. Austin's works, Benedictine edition, p. 164.]

<sup>l</sup> [In the Appendix to vol. x. of the Benedictine edition, p. 3.]

<sup>m</sup> [Published at Heidelberg in 4to. 1605; by Schottus in 1623, 1629, and at Paris in 1638. They are also printed in the Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. vii. Lyons edition.]

<sup>n</sup> [See Jo. Cassiani opera, cura A. Gazæi, fol. Atrebatii, 1628. p. 1036.]

<sup>o</sup> [See Cyrilli Alexandrini Opera, cura I. Auberti, fol. Lutetiæ, 1638. tom. i. p. 343.]



- 323<sup>p</sup>. (A. D. 423.) Theodoretus in 1 Cor. vii. 14.  
Epitome Decret. Divin. lib. v.  
340<sup>q</sup>. (A. D. 440.) Leo magnus Papa, Epist. 37. ad Neonam.  
Epist. 92, ad Rusticum, cap. 16.  
Epist. 86, ad Nicetam Aquilejensem. Item Epist.  
88, ad Episcopos Germ.

All these were contemporary with St. Austin, but younger than he, and wrote before the year 450. And in the next fifty or sixty years, these following :

- 372<sup>r</sup>. (A. D. 472.) Faustus Rhegiensis, one of those then called Semi-pelagians, de libero Arbitrio, lib. i. c. 1, 2, 14.  
395<sup>s</sup>. (A. D. 495.) Gennadius, One of the same, de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, c. 52.

And his interpolator, a Prædestinarian, c. 31.

- 407<sup>t</sup>. (A. D. 507.) Fulgentius, a Prædestinarian, de Veritate Prædestinationis, lib. i. *per totum*.

De Incarnatione et Gratia Jesu Christi, c. 15,  
item 30.

De Fide ad Petrum, c. 27, 30, &c.

De Remissione Peccatorum, lib. i. c. 14.

Epistola Synodica Episcoporum in Sardinia exulum ; Bibl. Patr. Colon.

1618. tom. vi. De Prædestinatione et Gratia, c. 3.<sup>u</sup>

- 420<sup>x</sup>. (A. D. 520.) Joannes Maxentius, Catholica de Christo Professio,  
*prope finem*. Bibl. Patr. tom. vi.

- 417<sup>y</sup>. (A. D. 517.) The council of Gerunda, Can. 5.

- 424<sup>z</sup>. (A. D. 524.) The council of Ilerda, Can. 13.

- 423<sup>a</sup>. (A. D. 523.) Ferrandus, (a deacon of Carthage) his letter to Fulgentius about the baptism of a certain negro.

- 423<sup>b</sup>. (A. D. 523.) Fulgentius' Answer.

<sup>p</sup> [These are found in volumes 3 and 4 of the works of Theodoret, published by Sirmondus, fol. Paris, 1642.]

<sup>q</sup> [The epistles of Leo were published in 1591, 1671, and 1675, 2 tom. 4to. This last is the most full and correct edition. The epistles named in the text, bear in this the numbers 135, 2, 6 ; and the last of them, as being considered spurious, is placed in vol. ii. p. 632. They are also printed in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. vii. and in the Councils ; by Labbe, vol. iii. by Mansi, vols. v. and vi.]

<sup>r</sup> [This work of Faustus is published in the Bibliotheca Patrum, Lyons edition, vol. viii. p. 525.]

<sup>s</sup> [See the edition of Hamburg, 4to. 1614.]

<sup>t</sup> [See Fulgentii Opera, cura G. Desprez,

4to. Paris, 1684.—Also the Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. ix. Lyons edition ; and tom. xi. edit. Gallandi.]

<sup>u</sup> [See also the Collection of Councils ; by Labbe, tom. iv. p. 1593 ; by Mansi, tom. viii. p. 592.]

<sup>x</sup> [See the Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. ix. p. 534, edit. Lyons.]

<sup>y</sup> [See the Councils ; Labbe, tom. iv. p. 1568 ; Mansi, tom. viii. p. 549.]

<sup>z</sup> See the Councils ; Labbe, tom. iv. p. 1613 ; Mansi, tom. viii. p. 612.]

<sup>a</sup> [See Fulgentii Ferrandi opera, cura Chiffletii, 4to. Divione, 1649 — p. 55. Also the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. ix. Lyons edition ; vol. xi. edit. Gallandi.]

<sup>b</sup> [See F. Ferrandi Opera, p. 58. and the Bibliotheca Patrum, as above.]

The substance of this last mentioned letter, and the answer to it, is this: a gentleman of Carthage had bought a negro slave, that had been brought out of the inmost and savage part of Africa, where Christianity was not then, nor is yet known. His master had caused him to be instructed in the faith: he was a catechumen for some time, and at last was admitted among the competents for baptism. He had rehearsed in the congregation the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, &c., and had made the usual renunciations of the Devil, &c., as the custom of that church was for the competents to do some days before their baptism; and at the time of baptism they used to do it by way of answer, again. But just before the time in which he was to be baptized, he fell sick of so sudden and violent a fever, that at the time of baptism he was speechless, and without sense. They baptized him however: 'And we,' says Ferrandus, 'answered in his name, as if it had been for an infant. And he dying presently after, never understood, I believe, that he was baptized. Now I entreat your opinion, whether his want of speech will be no hinderance to his obtaining eternal salvation. For I am much afraid lest our Lord, to whom all things are possible, did therefore deny him the faculty of speech, because he thought him unworthy of the benefit of the second birth. For how that age of his that was capable of reason, could be cleansed by another's confession, I do not see. For it is infants only, who have no sin but original sin, whom we believe to be saved by the faith of those that bring them, &c. And if it be said, that the confession he made before, when he was well in his senses, will avail for his forgiveness; I do not see how we can stand to that; for then another will conclude, that he would have been saved if he had had no bodily baptism at all. And at that rate, why might we not baptize people after they are dead, if they be such whose devout and faithful purpose was known before? I know the ordinary canon<sup>c</sup> prescribes that sick persons, that are not able to make the answers, may be baptized; provided their friends will at their own peril testify that they had such a purpose before their sickness. This indeed justifies the minister in giving the baptism: but I make some question concerning the benefit that such a person receives by it.'

The answer which the bishop Fulgentius gives to this scruple, tends all toward the comforting Ferrandus concerning his doubt of the man's salvation. He argues that all the condition required by our Saviour for adult persons being, that they should *believe and be baptized*; this man had both. That faith and the profession of it

are the act of the man: the baptizing him is the act of the minister. And though this man had not his senses when the minister performed his act; yet he had when he himself performed his own. That God's taking away his senses was not so great a sign of his rejecting him, as the continuance of his life till he could be baptized, was of his receiving him. 'It is true,' says he, 'that we believe 'none but infants are saved by the faith of those that bring them, ' &c.; and that in the age of reason one's own confession is required, ' &c. But this man had his senses when he professed, and he had 'yet life when he was baptized.'

He grants in the following discourse, that if he had died before he had been actually baptized, he could not have been saved: which is very hard, and contrary to the determination of St. Ambrose and other Fathers in a like case, as I shew in my Second Part<sup>d</sup>.

The reason why I recite this at large, rather than the other passages to which I have given references, is not that it speaks more plainly than the rest about infant-baptism: on the contrary, the rest speak more directly to that matter than this does. But I recite it, that the earnest concern that this master and minister and bishop do shew for the salvation of this poor slave, may fly in the face, and strike with shame and terror the consciences of such profane traders of our nation, as having plantations in the West Indies, do keep hundreds of such negroes, and are so far from any concern for their souls, that on the contrary they do all they can to hinder them from Christian faith and baptism, and discourage those that would procure them means of it.

I do not conceive that all the masters there are of this temper. But for those that are, and are resolved to continue so; as I doubt they have but little belief of the truth of the scripture; so it were for their interest that it were not true. For there is nothing plainer by the tenor of it, than that such masters are in God's sense a much worse sort of heathens than their slaves, and liable to a far greater condemnation; and that beside their own personal sins, the blood of those poor creatures will be required at their hands. I would crave leave to recommend to these gentlemen the reading of a little book, published about twenty years ago, by a clergyman<sup>e</sup>

<sup>d</sup> Ch. iii. § 3. Item ch. vi. § 3.

<sup>e</sup> [Viz. the Rev. Morgan Godwyn, student of Christ Church, Oxford; who 'became minister in Virginia, and continued there many years,' says Antony à Wood. He published 'The Negro's or 'Indian's Advocate, suing for their ad-

'mission into the Church; or a per-suasive to the instructing and baptizing 'of the Negroes and Indians in our 'plantations.' 8vo. London, 1680; and in the next year, 'A supplement' to the 'Negro's and Indian's Advocate,' in one sheet and a half, quarto.]



that had lived in Barbadoes, called 'The Negro's and Indian's 'Advocate.'

That I may tell the reader in short the substance of the places to which I have referred him; they do all speak of infant-baptism, as of a thing taken for granted. And those of them that do at all enlarge on the matter, do speak of it as absolutely necessary to the infant's obtaining the kingdom of heaven. And this, whether they be of the Prædestinarian or Semi-pelagian opinion. And I am confident there is no passage in any author from this time to the  
 1050. year of Christ 1150, or thereabouts, that speaks against it;  
 (A.D. 1150.) save that Walafridus Strabo, about the year 850 (though  
 750. (A.D. 850.) he were for infants' baptism, and thought it necessary for their salvation, yet) gave his singular opinion, that it had not been practised from the beginning, but had come into use first in St. Austin's time; which how palpable a mistake it was, I suppose every reader is by this time satisfied. I give you his words hereafter<sup>f</sup>. And save that Mr. Stennet produces one Macaire, an unknown author, living in the ignorant times, who talks much as Strabo does. Of whom I must also speak hereafter, part ii. ch. 2.

## CHAP. XXIII.

*Quotations out of some books that are spurious, i. e. were not written by those whose name they bear; but yet are proved to be ancient.*

§ I. LET the first of these be that out of the book called  
 300. 'Clement's Constitutions.' They are called his, because  
 (A.D. 400.) he is feigned to have been the compiler of them from the mouths of the apostles. The history of which book, as near as learned men have traced it, is this:

There were in the very early times certain traditionary accounts handed about as the preachings, doctrines, or rules that had been delivered by such or such an apostle or apostolical man: something like the shorthand notes of sermons, which it was the late custom in England to take from the mouths of celebrated preachers. One of which would be called, for example, *Διδαχὴ Πέτρου* 'the doctrine of Peter:' another, *Διδασκαλία Κλήμεντος*, 'the preaching of Clement,' &c. And several of these being by some studious

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. ch. 2. § 2.



persons collected and put together, were entitled Διατάξεις Ἀποστόλων, 'the Rules, or Constitutions of the Apostles<sup>a</sup>.'

If they had been all of them judicious and sincere persons that first took these notes of the preachings or sayings of the apostles; and they that collected them into volumes had been the like; there is no doubt but the collections would have been highly valuable. And as they are, they do for the most part consist of pious rules and exhortations. But according to the various memories, or judgment, or honesty of the first recorders, or after-compilers, these compositions were in many things various, uncertain, and by men of different inclinations differently interpolated, and so of no authority.

<sup>220.</sup> In Eusebius' time, anno 320, there was a volume of  
(A.D. 320.) this nature, called Διδαχαὶ Ἀποστόλων, 'Doctrines of the  
<sup>270.</sup> 'Apostles;' which he reckons<sup>b</sup> among the spurious books.  
(A.D. 370.) Epiphanius<sup>c</sup> fifty years after cites a book called 'Constitutions of  
'the Apostles;' which he says was of doubtful credit; and it has  
<sup>300.</sup> also been altered since his time. About the year 400 it  
(A.D. 400.) seems to have been licked and brought into that form of  
eight books, in which we now have it, and to have been set forth  
with that confident title, as if the whole had been put into form by  
St. Clement. This is confirmed by the quotations<sup>d</sup> of it by the  
Author of the 'Opus imperfectum in Matthæum,' who lived about  
that time.

Hence it appears, that for any particular clause or chapter of it, one does not know how long, or how little while before the year 400 it has been inserted. The clause to the present purpose is this,

Constitut. Apostolic. lib. vi. cap. 15.

The apostles are there brought in speaking. And after they have disallowed of such as baptize twice; and also set forth the wickedness of those that despise all baptism, they say:

'And he that says, "I will be baptized when I am going to die, that I may not sin after it, and defile my baptism;" such a man

<sup>a</sup> [The Constitutions of the Apostles appear to have been first published in Greek in the year 1540: Cotelierius edited them in Greek and Latin, with learned notes and dissertations, among his *Patres Apostolici*, 2 tom. fol. 1700, reprinted 1724. The Greek text, accompanied by an English version and a dissertation, was given by Whiston, in his 'Primitive Christianity revived,' vols. 2 and 3, 8vo. 1711. And the text is printed by Gallandi, in his edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. iii.]

<sup>b</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. 25.

<sup>c</sup> [Hæres. xlv. sect. 5: item Hæres. lxx. sect. 10-12. Hæres. lxxv. sect. 6. lxxx. sect. 7.]

<sup>d</sup> [See these given by Cotelierius, at tom. i. p. 191 of his edition of the *Patres Apostolici*; also by Gallandi, at p. 5 of his prefatory matter to the Constitutions, *Bibl. Patrum*, tom. iii. The work itself is found among the spurious pieces ascribed to St. Chrysostom, in vol. vi. of Montfaucon's edition, p. lxxiv.]

'has no true knowledge of God, and is ignorant of his nature. For, *Delay not thou to turn to the Lord; for thou knowest not what to-morrow will bring forth.*'

And then they add,

Βαπτίζετε δὲ ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια, καὶ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοουθεσίᾳ Θεοῦ. Ἄφετε γὰρ, φησὶ, τὰ παῖδιά ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά.

'And baptize your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of God. For he says, *Suffer the little children to come to me, and forbid them not.*'

How little assurance soever there is, from the credit of this book, that these are the apostle's words; yet they shew that it was the received doctrine at the time when they were put into the book.

II. The quotation of the book of 'The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy'<sup>d</sup> is commonly thought worth the while by those that write on this subject. Otherwise I for my part should hardly think it worth the setting down.

Partly, because of the abhorrence one should have of so gross and  
300. impudent a forger; who having, about the year 400, if  
(A. D. 400.) not later, composed some books remarkable for nothing but affected highflown expressions, thought them fit to be fathered upon Dionysius the Areopagite, mentioned Acts xvii. 34. Unless we are to think that the author himself was not guilty of this imposture; but that somebody else having got the copies of these books into his hands, did thrust in here and there a sentence which should represent that Dionysius as the author. Which I have sometimes thought.

And partly, because what he says on this subject seems to me spoken with less judgment than usual; towering in words, but shallow in sense.

I shall forbear setting down the original, (for it is not worth reciting twice,) only give the translation of his bombast Greek in as plain English as I can.

He in this treatise gives an account of the several rites used at the eucharist, at ordinations, &c., and among the rest, at baptism, (which he generally calls by the name of the *divine birth*), and of the reasons of them. What he has of baptism does mostly concern the baptism of the adult, and their professions. What he says of the baptism of infants, is in answer to the objections the heathens made against it, and is as follows:

<sup>d</sup> [See Dionysii Areopagitæ Opera, studio B. Corderii, 2 tom. fol. Lutetiæ, 1644.]

Ecclesiastic. Hierarch. cap. 7. *in fine*. [sect. II.  
tom. i. p. 360.]

‘ But that children also, who cannot yet understand the divine  
‘ mysteries, should be made partakers of the divine birth, and of the  
‘ most sacred signs of society with God, does seem, as you say, to  
‘ men that are profane and ill-affected to our religion, a thing fit to be  
‘ laughed at: that the bishops should teach the holy things to those  
‘ that are incapable of them, and should bestow the things which by  
‘ sacred tradition they have received, upon such as have no sense of  
‘ them. And, what is more ridiculous, that others should pronounce  
‘ the renunciations and holy professions for them in such a fashion  
‘ as if they were doing it for themselves.

‘ Now your episcopal wisdom ought not to be angry with those  
‘ that are in error; but to answer their objections with a religious  
‘ meekness, for their instruction and edification: adding this also as  
‘ from our holy religion; that our knowledge is not able to compre-  
‘ hend all divine things: and that a great many things which we  
‘ cannot understand, have really reasons that are worthy of God, un-  
‘ known to us, but known to the higher beings: and even those  
‘ higher natures are ignorant of many things which are known only  
‘ to the all-wise Deity, the author of all wisdom.

‘ And yet, as to this particular matter, that we do say the same  
‘ things which our divine ministers of holy things have delivered  
‘ down to us as they were taught them from ancient tradition. For  
‘ they say, and it is true, that children, if they be brought up to  
‘ holy rules and institutions, will come to be of a good temper of  
‘ mind; free, and disentangled from all error, and out of the danger  
‘ of an unclean life. Our divine instructors considering this, have  
‘ thought fit that children should be admitted after this holy  
‘ manner:

‘ That the natural parents of the child which is brought, should  
‘ deliver him to some one that is himself baptized, as to a good in-  
‘ structor in the things of God: and that the child should after-  
‘ ward learn of him, as of his father in God, and his sponsor in  
‘ things that are for salvation. And then of this person, who un-  
‘ dertakes to instruct the child in holiness of life, the bishop does  
‘ demand, as I may call it, the declaration of his renouncings, and  
‘ the other holy professions. Not that he does (as they jeeringly  
‘ represent it) initiate the one in the other’s stead in the holy rites:  
‘ for he does not say thus; “I do in the stead of this child renounce  
‘ or promise,” &c.; but, “This child does renounce, profess,” &c.;  
‘ that is, I promise to persuade this child, when he shall come of



‘age to understand the holy things, by my religious instructions, to renounce the adverse powers, and keep clear from them, and to profess and fulfil the divine proposals.’

‘It is therefore, as far as I can see, no absurdity that the child should be entered into the divine life; whenas he has a guide and sponsor that will instruct him in the knowledge of divine things, and keep him safe from the adverse powers. And the bishop does make the child partaker of the holy mysteries, that he may be educated according to them, and may lead no other life but such as has always a regard to those divine things, and an agreement with them, and is in a holy manner habituated to them. And to this he is led by his divine sponsor.’

His mentioning *ancient tradition* in this matter, would make one think what I hinted before, that the author had no purpose of putting on the vizor of Dionysius the Areopagite: for to make him talk of ancient tradition in any thing of Christianity, which was all new in his time, was to betray his own cheat. Beside, it is not in this book of the ‘Ecclesiastical Hierarchy,’ that there are any tokens of its being written by Dionysius, but only in some of the other books of the same author.

The interpretation he gives of the professions made by the godfathers is very singular: he will not have it that the godfather does renounce, profess, &c. in the child’s name or stead. But both the ancients generally, and the moderns, do so understand it as that he does. But perhaps both of these may be reconciled. The godfather does not profess in the child’s stead, so as that the godfather’s performance of those professions should be in stead of the child’s performance of them: and in this sense this author denies it. But the godfather does profess in the child’s stead so as to declare the obligation of the child to perform, and does in his name own that obligation, and make the promise: and in this sense the other ancients affirm it. To the intent it may more fully be declared that the benefits of baptism are conveyed to the child not absolutely, but on condition that if he live, he do perform his part of the covenant; the godfather expresses those things that are the child’s part. As if a great benefactor will settle a large estate of inheritance on a child, upon condition that he pay a small quitrent in acknowledgment; this is so beneficial to the child, that there ought to be no doubt of his acceptance. The contract is therefore made in the child’s name: and because he is not of age, his guardian seals it in his stead. This the church of England does more plainly express; who puts the words thus, ‘Dost thou in the name of this child re-



‘nounce?’ &c. And so did the ancients, who put them thus, ‘Does this child renounce?’ &c.

As for the age in which these books were written, it is best gathered from Photius<sup>e</sup>: who gives the abstract of a book written by Theodorus Presbyter, wherein he pretended to maintain that these books are the genuine work of Dionysius the Areopagite, against some that then opposed the authenticity of them. The man must have had a hard task. But yet it is a proof that they were known then, and for some time before. This Theodorus lived, as Dr. Hammond says<sup>f</sup>, anno 420; but others place him much later, in the seventh century.

III. There does not lie any such prejudice for any design of forgery against the author of the ‘*Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos*’, which commonly go among the works of Justin Martyr; only that piece going about, as it seems, without the name of the author, somebody in the early times ascribed it to him. It cannot be his, because it makes mention of Irenæus and of Origen, who lived something after his time; unless those passages that mention Irenæus and Origen have been since the first writing of the book foisted into it. I shall not pretend to guess at the time of the writing of it; only it is known to be ancient. The passage I would quote is this,  
*Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos, quæst. 56.*

Ἐρώτησις.

Εἰ τὰ τελευτῶντα βρέφη ἔπαινον ἢ μέμψιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξ ἔργων, τίς ἡ διαφορὰ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν ὑπὸ ἄλλων μὲν βαπτισθέντων καὶ μηδὲν πραξάντων, καὶ τῶν μὴ βαπτισθέντων καὶ ὁμοίως μηδὲν πραξάντων;

Ἀπόκρισις.

Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν βαπτισθέντων πρὸς τὰ μὴ βαπτισθέντα, τοῦ τυχεῖν μὲν τὰ βαπτισθέντα τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν, τὰ δὲ μὴ βαπτισθέντα μὴ τυχεῖν. Ἀξιοῦνται δὲ τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν, τῇ πίστει τῶν προσφερόντων αὐτὰ τῷ βαπτίσματι.

Question.

‘Since children that die in infancy have no praise nor no blame from any thing that they have done, what difference will be made at the resurrection between such of them as have been by the means of others baptized but have done nothing themselves, and such as have not been baptized and have likewise done nothing?’

<sup>e</sup> [See Photii Bibliotheca, p. 3, 4. edit. Hæschelii, fol. Rothomagi, 1653. Photius however gives no ‘abstract,’ beyond one single sentence, Ἀνεγνώσθη Θεοδώρου πρεσβυτέρου, ὅτι γνησία ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου Διονυσίου βίβλος.]

<sup>f</sup> Six Queries. Infant Baptism. [The editor of Photius observes, and as was natural to him, laments, that this work of Theodorus is not now extant.]

<sup>g</sup> [See Justini Martyris opera, edit. Benedictin. fol. Paris. 1742. p. 462.]

## Answer.

‘ This will be the difference between those that have been baptized, and those that have not: that the baptized will be made partakers of the blessings granted by baptism; and the unbaptized not. And these blessings of baptism are vouchsafed to them for the sake of the faith of those that bring them to baptism.’

He speaks of the case of unbaptized infants after the rate that most Greek writers do, viz. that they will lose all reward, without mentioning any positive punishment. This was the general opinion of the Christians of the Greek church, that infants dying unbaptized would miss of heaven, but not be under any positive punishment: as appears by the words of Gregory Nazianzen cited before<sup>h</sup>, and as I shall more fully shew at another place<sup>i</sup>.

IV. There is a spurious book ascribed to Athanasius, called *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, which gives their opinion in this matter very particularly. Some quotations out of that book ought to have had a place here, but that it seems to have been written after our period, and by ignorant men crowded in among the works of Athanasius<sup>k</sup>. But the following passage I recite, because of its affinity to the foregoing:

*Quæst. ad Antiochum, qu. 115.*

Ἐρώτησις.

Ποῦ ὑπάγουσι τὰ τελευτῶντα [πιστὰ] νήπια; εἰς κόλασιν, ἢ εἰς βασιλείαν; καὶ ποῦ τὰ τῶν ἀπίστων νήπια; καὶ ποῦ τὰ τῶν πιστῶν ἀβάπτιστα ἀποθνήσκοντα τάττονται; μετὰ τῶν πιστῶν, ἢ ἀπίστων;

Ἀπόκρισις.

Τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος, Ἄφετε τὰ παῖδια ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς μὲ, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ πάλιν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου φάσκοντος, νῦν δὲ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἁγία ἐστι. Πρόδηλον ὅτι ὡς ἄσπιλα καὶ πιστὰ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέρχονται τὰ τῶν πιστῶν βεβαπτισμένα νήπια. Τὰ δὲ ἀβάπτιστα καὶ τὰ ἐθνικὰ οὔτε εἰς βασιλείαν εἰσέρχονται ἀλλ’ οὔτε πάλιν εἰς κόλασιν. Ἀμαρτίαν γὰρ οὐκ ἔπραξαν.

## Question.

‘ Whither do [faithful] infants go when they die, into punishment, or into the kingdom? And particularly, whither go the children of heathens? And where are placed the children of the faithful that die unbaptized? Are they placed with the believers, or with the unbelievers?’

## Answer.

‘ Insomuch as our Lord says, *Suffer little children to come to me,*

<sup>h</sup> Chap. xi. § 6.

<sup>i</sup> Part ii. chap. 6. § 4.

<sup>k</sup> [See Athanasii opera, studio Mona-

chorum Benedictin. 3 tom. fol. Paris. 1698.  
tom. ii. p. 295.]

‘for of such is the kingdom of heaven: and again the apostle says, ‘Now are your children holy, [or saints,] it is plain that the children of believers do, if they be baptized, go as spotless and faithful into the kingdom. But those of them that are not baptized, do not enter the kingdom, as also neither do the children of unbelievers. But yet neither on the other side do they go into torment; for they have committed no sin.’

They that would read any more of those spurious passages that are later than the year 400, but ascribed to authors before that time, and yet are not very scandalous, as being really within a century of it, or thereabouts, in which there happens to be mention of infant-baptism, may have some of them in the said book: *Athanasii Quaestiones ad Antiochum, quæst. 2. item qu. 66.* And also, *Athanasii Dicta et interpretatio Parabolarum S. Script. quæst. 94.*

And more in books ascribed to St. Chrysostom, as Chrysostom in Psal. xiv. ‘One brings an infant to be baptized; presently the priest requires a covenant,’ &c. Idem, *Homilia de Adam et Eva.* ‘Let us consider the meaning of what the church all over the world practises in the baptizing of infants or adult persons,’ &c.

V. There is also commonly produced a passage very ancient indeed; if one might rely upon it: an order of Hyginus, <sup>22.</sup> (A. D. 122.) bishop of Rome; that ‘in all baptisms there must be one [patrinus] godfather, and one godmother.’ But as this is of no credit for authenticalness, having no voucher elder than Platina<sup>1</sup>, so also it does not necessarily relate to infants: for they had witnesses that are sometimes called *patrini*, in the case of adult persons.

This sort of testimonies is better omitted. For in any cause whatever, evidences of no good credit do more hurt than good.

<sup>1</sup> In vita Hygini. [Historia de vita et moribus summorum Pontificum. The editions of this work are numerous.]

# THE HISTORY OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

---

## PART II.

---

### CHAPTER I.

*Of some other Passages which are cited, and pretended to be to this purpose, but are not.*

§ 1. THE passages produced in the first part, are all that I have met with in authors that wrote in the first four centuries; saving that in St. Austin's works there are, as I said, a great many more; but all to the same purpose.

In some collections of this nature I have seen several other quotations pretended to be out of authors within the said term. But they are either,

1. Out of such books as are now discovered to be forgeries of late years. Or,

2. They are nothing to the purpose. Or,

3. Wrested and altered by those that cite them to another sense than what they carry in the authors themselves. Or,

4. Such wherein the author does not say that for which he is cited: but he says something from whence the other does draw it as a consequence; and then sets down that consequence, as if it were the author's own words. Or,

5. Quotations absolutely false.

First, out of such books as are now discovered to be no true works of the authors, whose name they bear, but forgeries of later years.

So there are quotations for infant-baptism, taken out of the Decretal epistles, which have been set out under the name of the



<sup>730.</sup>  
(A. D. 830.) most ancient bishops of Rome, but were, as I shewed before<sup>a</sup>, really forged long after that time. As for the spurious quotations that are of any tolerable credit for antiquity, I gave before some account of them<sup>b</sup>.

II. Secondly, many that are produced are nothing to the purpose.

As, when the antipædobaptists do fill their collections of this nature with passages out of the ancient Fathers that relate to the baptizing of adult persons. There is no pædobaptist, but does grant that there are innumerable such places; for in the first 300 or 400 years of Christianity, (in which space of time it was that the greatest part of the heathen world, being converted, came into the church,) the baptisms of grown persons converted were more in number than the baptisms of the children of Christians: as it must needs be, since the apostles, at their death, left the world in such a state, as that there was probably a hundred heathens left for one Christian; even in the Roman empire, where they spent most of their pains; but at the end of 300 or 400 years, there were probably ten Christians for one heathen. Now in that space of time there are recorded a great many sermons and other discourses persuading people to come in and be baptized: and in those discourses they instruct them in what is necessary thereto, as, that they must first understand and believe the principles of the Christian religion, and resolve to forsake their wicked courses and idolatrous worships. And commonly when they are upon this theme, they speak of baptism just as the church of England does in the Catechism; that there is required of persons to be baptized, repentance and faith. There are also extant many sermons made to the persons newly baptized, putting them in mind of their vow and covenant. And it is common for the antipædobaptists to cite some passages out of such discourses, which, taken by themselves, look as if those authors were against infant-baptism, and allowed it only to grown persons; but the contrary appears in that the same authors, in other places, when they speak of the case of infants, do shew their opinion and practice to have been otherwise: and that they looked upon that as a particular and excepted case. For this sort of quotations is often made out of Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and even St. Austin himself.

In short, they have in this matter dealt with those ancient authors just as they did lately with Mr. Baxter; who being busy in writing something in defence of infant-baptism, heard the hawkers

<sup>a</sup> Part i. ch. 16. § 1, 2.

<sup>b</sup> Part i. ch. 23.

cry under his window<sup>c</sup>, ‘Mr. Baxter’s Arguments for Believers,’ &c. being a pamphlet of collections taken out of some of Mr. Baxter’s works, wherein he, speaking of the terms of the baptismal covenant, had shewn the necessity of a justifying faith in order to baptism; though in the same books he had declared he spoke in reference to adult persons only. On which occasion Mr. Baxter says, ‘the men  
‘that cite authors at this rate, cite me against myself, with the like  
‘confidence.’

Indeed, Mr. Tombes wrote a piece against Mr. Baxter, called, *Felo de se*<sup>d</sup>, or, *The Self-destroyer*: in which he endeavoured to shew, that though Mr. Baxter intended these proofs of the necessity of faith, only in the case of the baptism of adult persons; yet ‘his  
‘arguments prove more: and that the middle terms of his argu-  
‘ments do beat down his own tenet of infant-baptism.’ If the antipædobaptists had dealt only thus in their quotations out of the ancients; and had declared their purpose to be, to improve these sayings of the Fathers to confute the opinion and practice of the said Fathers themselves; none could deny them the liberty of making their best of such a course. And they may, if they think fit, indict the Fathers of being *Felones de se*. But it is common with them to cite such passages, as evidences that the authors were against infant-baptism; or, that there was no baptism of infants practised in those ages, or those churches, because they find such passages concerning the baptizing of grown persons, and concerning the qualifications required in them.

Such places as these I have left out, inasmuch as they only prove that there were frequent baptisms of adult persons in those times; which nobody denies.

Yet I shall here set down for instance two of them, which do in appearance, the most of any that I have met with, make for the purpose of the antipædobaptists.

270. (A. D. 370.) *Basil. contra Eunomium*, lib. iii.<sup>e</sup>

Πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ πρότερον ἔλα τῷ βαπτίσματι ἐπισφραγίσασθαι.

‘For one must believe first: and then be sealed with baptism.’

278. (A. D. 378.) *Hieronym. in Matt. xxviii. 19.*

‘Primum docent omnes gentes, deinde doctas intingunt aqua:  
‘non enim potest fieri ut corpus baptismi recipiat sacramentum, nisi  
‘ante anima fidei susceperit veritatem.’

<sup>c</sup> Baxter, *More Proofs of Infants’ Church Membership and right to Baptism*, p. 414.

<sup>d</sup> [*Felo de se*; or Baxter’s *Self-destroying*, in twenty arguments against Infant-

baptism, gathered out of his own writing. 4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1659.

<sup>e</sup> [Sect. 5. Op. tom. i. p. 276. ed. Benedict. 1721.]

‘ They first teach all the nations, then when they are taught they baptize them with water ; for it cannot be that the body should receive the sacrament of baptism, unless the soul have before received the true faith.’

St. Hierome here commenting on the commission given by our Saviour to the apostles<sup>f</sup> of carrying the gospel to the nations that were heathens, explains the method they were to use, viz. first, to teach those nations the Christian religion, and then to baptize them ; which all pædobaptists grant to be the method that ought ever to be used. For if there be any nation of Indians to be converted now-days, they use the same : and yet, when they have converted and baptized the parents, they do also, at the parents’ desire, baptize what children they have. And it is of such heathen people or nations that St. Hierome here speaks, that their minds must be instructed before their bodies be baptized.

St. Basil is there proving, against the heretic Eunomius, the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, by this argument ; that we are baptized in the name of them as well as of the Father, and consequently are to believe in them ; for that baptism supposes faith in that Deity in whose name the baptism is. And applying this to the case of one that learns the faith of the Christian, shews that he must be taught to believe in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, (viz. that each of these persons is God,) or else ought not to be baptized with those words ; and that consequently the Eunomians did in effect renounce their baptism by renouncing this faith. As there was no dispute between the catholics and Eunomians about infant-baptism ; so St. Basil will appear to any one that reads him, not to have had any thought *pro* or *contra*, at that place, about it.

But it happens very unluckily for the purpose of those that produce these sayings, that both of these Fathers are known by other passages to have owned infant-baptism ; as I have shewn plainly in the First Part of this work.

III. Thirdly, some quotations that are brought, are wrested and altered by those that bring them to another sense than that which they carry in the authors themselves.

As for example : Danvers<sup>h</sup> cites out of Eusebius<sup>i</sup>, that Dionysius Alexandrinus writing to Sextus, bishop of Rome, testifies, ‘ that it

<sup>154.</sup> ‘ was their custom to baptize upon profession of faith ;  
(A.D. 254.) ‘ and that one who had been baptized by heretics, not

<sup>f</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19. [Op. tom. vii. p. 243. edit. Vallarsii.]

<sup>h</sup> Treatise of Baptism, p. 50, second edit.

<sup>g</sup> Chap. 12. 15. 19.

<sup>i</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. cap. 9.



‘ upon profession of faith, did desire to be so baptized, accounting  
‘ his former for no baptism.’

This, as it is here by Mr. Danvers brought in and worded, would seem to be an instance of a man that having been baptized in infancy, desired now to be baptized again. But that which Dionysius does there write, is in these words, and no other<sup>k</sup>:

‘ The man being present when some were baptized, and hearing  
‘ the interrogatories and answers, came to me weeping; and falling  
‘ down at my feet, confessed and declared, that the baptism where-  
‘ with he had been baptized by the heretics, was not this [or this  
‘ sort of] baptism, nor had any likeness to this of ours, but was full  
‘ of impieties and blasphemies. He said, he was sore troubled in  
‘ conscience, and durst not presume to lift up his eyes to God, for  
‘ that he was baptized with those profane words and ceremonies.’

Now this is clearly the case of a man that had been baptized by the Valentinians, (or some such heretics,) who, as Irenæus tells us<sup>l</sup>, did not baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; but with strange and profane forms of words which he there recites, and some of which I do hereafter recite<sup>m</sup>. All which is nothing relating to the case of infant-baptism: and he that compares the words, will observe how foully they are quoted.

IV. Fourthly, some quotations are yet more unfair: as, when the author cited does not say that for which he is cited; but he says something from whence the other does draw it as a consequence, and then sets down that consequence as if it were the author’s own words.

Thus Danvers, in the foresaid treatise<sup>n</sup> says, that St. Hierome, in  
278. his epistle against the errors of John bishop of Jerusalem,  
(A.D. 378.) says, ‘ that in the eastern churches the adults were only  
‘ baptized;’ and again, in his epistle to Pammachius, says, ‘ that they  
‘ are to be admitted to baptism to whom it doth properly belong,  
‘ viz. those only who have been instructed in the faith.’

Now if one read over that epistle of St. Hierome’s to Pammachius, against the errors of John bishop of Jerusalem, and all the other epistles of his to Pammachius, (for such work one has with quotations set down after such a blundering manner,) there is no such thing.

But this there is<sup>o</sup>: the said bishop having said, that ‘ in a certain

<sup>k</sup> Apud Eusebium, loc. citat.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. i. cap. 18. [cap. 21. edit. Bene-  
dict.]

<sup>m</sup> Chap. 5. § 1.

<sup>n</sup> Treatise of Baptism, p. 56.

<sup>o</sup> Epist. 61. ad Pammachium de erroribus, &c. *prope medium*. [Rather see St. Jerome’s treatise, ‘ Liber contra Joannem Jerosolymitanum,’ § 11, 12, 13.—Op. tom. ii. p. 419. ed. Vallars.]



‘ sermon of his he had fully discoursed of the faith and all the ‘ doctrines of the church :’ St. Hierome takes occasion to reprove this as a confident saying, that he should pretend to do all that in one sermon : and then adds, ‘ We have a custom to discourse for ‘ forty days together, to those that *are to be baptized*, concerning ‘ the Holy Trinity,’ &c. ‘ If you on that text could in one hour ‘ discourse of all the doctrinal points; what need is there to continue ‘ such discourses for forty days? But if you did recapitulate all that ‘ you used to preach in the whole Lent,’ &c.

There is also another passage toward the end of the epistle, where he thus expostulates with the said bishop; ‘ Do we divide the ‘ church, who but a few months ago, about Whitsuntide, (when ‘ the sun being eclipsed, people thought the day of judgment was ‘ coming,) did present forty persons of both sexes, and several ages, <sup>293.</sup> ‘ to your presbyters to be baptized? And yet we had five (A. D. 393.) ‘ presbyters then in the monastery, who might have done ‘ it by their own right; but they would do nothing to anger you. ‘ Or do not you rather divide the church, who ordered your ‘ presbyters at Bethlehem, that they should not give baptism to our ‘ candidates at Easter, whom we therefore sent to Diospolis to ‘ bishop Dionysius to be baptized?’

Here is indeed a plain account of adult persons baptized in those times; and that they used to be catechised all the Lent before their baptism. But he that shall conclude from hence, that they only were baptized, and then shall quote the place and set it down as St. Hierome’s words, [that in the eastern churches they only were admitted to baptism,] is by no means to be trusted with the quoting of authors.

V. Fifthly, some of the quotations brought in this case are absolutely false: and neither the words cited, nor any like them, are at all to be found in the books mentioned.

So Danvers in his said treatise<sup>r</sup> cites St. Hilary for three several <sup>254.</sup> sayings. The first whereof is found in the book mentioned: (A. D. 354.) the second is not; but there is a sentence to the same purpose in another book. These two are not so material as to need reciting here. The third (which is very material, if it were true) is, that St. Hilary should say, ‘ that all the eastern churches did only ‘ baptize the adult.’ The book he seems to refer to, is St. Hilary’s second book *de Trinitate*; for that only is mentioned. But neither

q [Ibid. sect. 42.]

<sup>r</sup> Part i. cent. 4. [in the ‘ Abstract of

‘ the History of Baptism throughout all ‘ ages,’ prefixed to his treatise.]

there (nor, as I am very confident, any where else) does St. Hilary say any such thing.

Both these last quotations out of St. Hierome and Hilary are amended in a postscript by Danvers<sup>s</sup>: and for *eastern* he says we must read *western*.

But this mends not the matter, but makes it worse: for there is no such thing said of either of them. Indeed if either Hierome or Hilary, or any other author of those times, had said that it was the custom either of the eastern church, or western church, or any church at all, to baptize only the adult; and the places where they said so could be produced; it would be a quotation more for the purpose of the antipædobaptists than any they have yet brought.

And for Mr. Danvers (after that Mr. Baxter<sup>t</sup> and Mr. Wills had so publicly challenged him for a forger of quotations; and Wills had put in an appeal to his own party against him) to amend in a P. S. to the answer to the said appeal these quotations by putting 'western' for 'eastern,' as if the authors had really said so of one of them: this, if joined with a great many other instances in the said book, was the boldest attempt upon the belief of a reader that ever I knew made.

It would have been a very tedious thing both to me and the reader, to recite all such quotations, and then to shew the falseness or mistake of them. But instead of doing that, I do declare that all that I have seen that seemed to be to the purpose I have searched; and the search after such as have proved false, spurious, &c., has cost me as much pains as the collecting of these true ones.

And of those that I have so seen or searched, I have left out none in this collection that make for or against the baptism of infants, but such as are (and, I think, plainly) of some of the five sorts before mentioned. And if any one, that meets with any other which I have not met with, will be so kind as to inform me of it, by word or letter, I will (if I live to see any more editions of this mean work) add it to the rest; and that indifferently, as I said, whether it make for or against pædobaptism: provided it be genuine, and to the purpose, and out of authors within the time limited.

<sup>s</sup> Postscript to the Baptist's Answer to Wills's Appeal against Danvers.

<sup>t</sup> [See Baxter's 'More Proofs of Infants,' &c. 1675: the second part of which is a confutation of the strange

forgeries of Mr. H. Danvers. See also Wills' 'Infant Baptism asserted,' &c. 'in answer to H. Danvers, with a full detection of his misrepresentation,' &c. 8vo. 1675.]

## CHAP. II.

*The Opinions of Modern learned Men, concerning the Ancient Practice or Omission of Pædobaptism.*

§ I. AS for what later authors have said concerning the practice of these primitive times; it would be a voluminous work to collect all their opinions or verdicts. Neither would it answer so much pains, to have the account of the modern writers, as to what they judge may be collected from the ancient writings, when we ourselves have the writings themselves to recur to. Yet it may be worth the while to spend a few words on that matter in general.

1. And first, it is notorious, that almost all the learned men in the world that have occasion to mention this matter, do conclude from what they read, that it has been the general practice of the Christian church from the beginning, to baptize infants. To name any particulars were endless and frivolous.

2. Some few (as it happens in all matters) are of a different opinion concerning the ancient practice. And they are of two sorts.

Some have thought that there was a time in the Christian church when no infants were baptized, but that pædobaptism was brought in after a certain term of years.

Others, that baptism of infants was practised from the beginning, but not universally; but that some Christians would baptize their infant children, and others would not. And that it was counted indifferent.

Of the first sort, viz. of those that have thought that there was a time when no baptism of infants was used, I know of none (besides Mr. Tombes himself) but Walafridus Strabo<sup>u</sup> and Ludovicus Vives: unless we are to add to them Curellæus and Rigaltius.

II. Strabo has some favour shewed him, when he is reckoned  
 750. among learned men. He lived in a very ignorant age;  
 (A. D. 850.) and for those times might pass for a learned man. He had read St. Austin's book of Confessions, and finding it mentioned there that St. Austin was baptized when he was of man's age, he seems to have concluded from thence, that it was in old time the general use for Christians to defer their children's baptism till they

<sup>u</sup> [Walafridus Strabo was a Benedictine monk, of the famous abbey of Fulda in Germany, and afterwards dean of St. Gallen. He died in or about the year

849, leaving behind him several pieces both in prose and poetry, which have come down to our times.]

were grown up: though he might with a little more advertency have found, by the same book, that St. Austin's father was a heathen when St. Austin was born, and for many years after; and did not turn Christian, nor was baptized himself, till a little before he died.

Of that instance of St. Austin, and some others, I shall speak in the next chapter. Strabo's words are these, '*Libro de exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum*<sup>v</sup>,' cap. 26:

'It is to be noted, that in the primitive times the grace of baptism was wont to be given to those only who were arrived to that maturity of body and mind, that they could know and understand what were the benefits of baptism, what was to be confessed and believed, and, in a word, what was to be observed of those that are regenerated in Christ. For the reverend Father Austin relates of himself in his book of Confessions, that he continued a catechumen till he was almost twenty-five years old: which he did with<sup>288</sup> 'that intention, that during that space being instructed (A. D. 388.) 'in all particulars, he might be led by his own freewill to choose what he thought fit; and that the heat of his youth being now abated, he might better observe that which he had purposed.

'But when the diligence about our divine religion increased; the Christians understanding that the original sin of Adam did involve in guilt, not only those who had added to it by their own wicked works, but those also who having done no wickedness themselves, yet because (as the Psalmist says) *they were conceived and born in iniquity*, cannot be free from sin, since they spring from a polluted root; so that the apostle had reason to say concerning all persons, *All have sinned, and have need<sup>x</sup> of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace*; and to say of Adam, *In whom all have sinned*:—the orthodox Christians, I say, understanding this, lest children should perish if they died without the remedy of the grace of regeneration, appointed them to be baptized for the forgiveness of sins.

'Not as some heretics, enemies of God's free grace, maintained, that there was no necessity for infants' baptism, because they had never sinned. If that doctrine were true, either they would not be baptized at all; or, if they were baptized without having any need of it, the sacrament of baptism would be imperfect in them, and not the true baptism which we in the creed confess to be given for the forgiveness of sins.

<sup>v</sup> [This work was published at Mayence, in the year 1549, and is reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. xv. Lyons

edition, and tom. ix. p. 950, edit. Colon.]

<sup>x</sup> [have need. The expression used by Strabo is *egent*.]



‘Therefore since all persons do perish by original sin, whom the grace of God does not free, (even such as have added no increase of their own wickedness,) infants are of necessity to be baptized. Which both St. Austin shews in his book *de Baptismo Parvulorum*, and the African councils testify, and is manifested by a great many other proofs from the other Fathers.’

This man, with his little reading, seems to have supposed that <sup>315.</sup> both the doctrine of pædobaptism, and also that of original (A. D. 415.) sin, had their beginning but about St. Austin’s time. His mistake in the first may appear by the quotations here produced; and in the other, by those mentioned by Vossius<sup>y</sup> in his Pelagian History. He also invents a reason for St. Austin’s delay of his baptism after he was grown up, which is utterly contrary to St. Austin’s own account; who relates at large in that his book of Confessions, that it was because he was in suspense whether he should be a Christian or a Manichee<sup>z</sup>. He miserably mistakes the doctrine of the Pelagians, as if they had denied infants’ baptism to be necessary. He himself owns it to be necessary; and yet says that the ancients used it not.

But indeed there appears through all his book an affectation to shew how all the doctrines and mysteries of the Christian religion have come to more and more perfection by process of time; as he makes the title of his book to be, ‘Of the beginning and advancement of ecclesiastical matters.’ And he was willing to say some such thing of baptism, that this chapter might be like the rest.

<sup>1422.</sup> III. What Ludovicus Vives<sup>a</sup> says of this matter, is in (A. D. 1522.) his commentaries upon St. Austin’s book *de Civitate Dei*, lib. i. cap. 27.

‘In former times no person was admitted to the holy font, till he were of age, and did understand what that mystical water meant, and did himself desire to be washed with it, and did express this

<sup>y</sup> [G. I. Vossius, *Historia de Controversiis quæ Pelagius ejusque reliquæ moverunt*; editio secunda, emendata et aucta, 4<sup>o</sup>. Amst. 1655. See particularly the second book.]

<sup>z</sup> [August. Confession. lib. v. cap. 14. § 25.—Op. tom. i. p. 118.]

<sup>a</sup> [John Louis Vives, a learned Spaniard, was born at Valencia, in the year 1492. Having studied at Paris and Louvain, and obtained a high reputation for learning, he was appointed by bishop Fox one of the fellows of his college of Corpus Christi, at Oxford; here he continued for some time, was admitted a

doctor of law, and read lectures in that and the belles lettres. His commentary on St. Austin’s work, ‘*De Civitate Dei*,’ was first published in 1522, with a dedication to king Henry VIII; it was reprinted in 1622, 1661, and is found in some collections of that Father’s works.

Vives subsequently falling under Henry’s displeasure, in the matter of the royal divorce, was imprisoned for some time; but recovering his liberty quitted England for Bruges in the Netherlands, where it is thought he ended his days, in 1537, or 1541.]

‘ desire more than once. A resemblance of which custom we see  
 ‘ still in our baptisms of infants. For an infant born that day, or  
 ‘ the day before, is asked the question, whether he will be baptized?  
 ‘ And that question they ask three times over. In whose name the  
 ‘ godfathers answer, that he does desire it. I hear that in some  
 ‘ cities of Italy the old custom is still in great measure preserved.’

Since this Vives lived so little while ago, and produces no proof out of any author to confirm his opinion; his affirming any thing concerning any old custom is of no more authority, than if any one now living should say the same without producing his proof. Especially since he was but a young man when he wrote these commentaries, and, though learned in philology and secular history, yet confesses himself in his preface to them, that as for divinity, which was none of his profession, he minded it only so far as his other studies would give him leave.

It is certain that the occasion given him, from St. Austin’s words, on which he there comments, to say any such thing, is very slender. For St. Austin is only speaking of some baptized at the age of understanding, without the least intimation that they were children of Christian parents.

And for the cities of Italy that he mentions, I think nobody ever heard of them before, nor since: unless we will suppose that some  
 1050. remainders of the Petrobrusians, who are said about 400  
 (A. D. 1150.) years before Vives’ time to have been antipædobaptists, and of whom I shall by and by give some account<sup>b</sup>, might continue that practice in some of the valleys of Piedmont. But if it were so, these men were too late, for any opinion concerning the ancient practice to be founded on what they did.

IV. Curcellæus<sup>c</sup> says the same thing as Vives does. And there  
 1550. is to be said of him not only what was said of Vives, that  
 (A. D. 1650.) affirming a thing of antiquity, he produces no quotation for proof, but also that he brings it in to maintain another tenet as paradoxical as this itself is. He has a ‘Dissertation concerning  
 ‘ Original Sin.’ He denies that there is any such thing; as most that are inclined to Socinianism do. He brings as an objection against his own doctrine, the custom of baptizing infants for forgiveness of sin. He answers<sup>d</sup>, ‘that the custom of baptizing  
 ‘ infants did not begin before the third century after Christ’s birth;  
 ‘ that in the first two there appear no footsteps of it.’

<sup>b</sup> Chap. vii. § 5.

<sup>c</sup> [See Stephani Curcellæi Opera Theologica, fol. Amst. 1675, p. 912.]

<sup>d</sup> § 56.

Whether that be true or no, will be partly judged by what I have here produced. It is best for any one that cannot prove what he says, to affirm it dictator-like.

V. It is doubtful in which of the two forementioned sorts, of 1578. those that have thought the practice of infant-baptism to (A. D. 1678.) have been, either not from the beginning, or not universal, one is to place Rigaltius<sup>e</sup>. He, in his annotations on those places of St. Cyprian, which I recited in the former part of this work<sup>f</sup>, seems willing to have it believed, that in the apostles' time there was no pædobaptism; but not willing to speak this plainly.

His discourse of this matter from texts of scripture is too large to repeat here; he uses no arguments but those that are common, and have their answers as common.

But what he speaks plainly of the matter of fact, as he takes it to have been, is this: 'From the age of the apostles to the time of 100. 'Tertullian, the matter continued *in ambiguo*, doubtful, (A. D. 200.) ' [or various]. And there were some, who on occasion of ' our Lord's saying, *Suffer little children to come to me*, (though he ' gave no order to baptize them,) did baptize even new-born infants; ' and, as if they were transacting some secular bargain with God ' Almighty, brought sponsors and bondsmen to be bound for them, ' that when they were grown up they should not depart from the ' Christian faith. Which custom Tertullian did not like. For, "what ' need is there," says he, "that the godfathers should be brought ' into danger," &c. [and so he recites at large the place of Tertullian, ' which I produced above<sup>h</sup>, and then proceeds,] Most men, thinking 150. ' this opinion of Tertullian unsafe, were of St. Cyprian's (A. D. 250.) ' mind, that even new-born children ought to be made ' partakers of the laver of salvation; which was also pitched upon ' in the decree of this synod; and so the doubt was taken away.'

And in his annotations on the other place of St. Cyprian<sup>i</sup>, he passes this censure upon the practice of those times. 'They gave 150. ' the sign of faith to a person before he was capable of (A. D. 250.) ' faith itself: they made the sign without the thing, to ' stand instead of the thing itself.'

The zealous bishop of Oxford, who since wrote annotations on the

<sup>e</sup> [Nicolaus Rigaltius published an edition of St. Cyprian's works at Paris, in 1648, folio. His notes were retained in the subsequent ones, of Priorius, Paris, 1666, and bishop Fell, Oxford, 1682. They are noticed, but not given at length, in the Benedictine edition, fol. Paris, 1726.]

<sup>f</sup> Part i. ch. 6. § 1, and 11.

<sup>g</sup> Annot. in Cypriani Epistolam ad Fidum. [scil. epist. 59. in editt. Rigaltii et Benedictin. 64, in edit. Fellii, 1682.]

<sup>h</sup> Part i. chap. 4. § 5.

<sup>i</sup> Lib. de Lapsis. [See Rigaltii observationes, p. 159. edit. 1648: p. 125, edit. Oxon.]



same Father's works, and who generally treats Rigaltius with that respect which his great learning deserves; yet on this account spares not to say<sup>i</sup>, 'that he has in this matter acted the part, not of 'an annotator on St. Cyprian, but a prevaricator with him:' and that 'what he says here, is no other sort of stuff than what some 'fanatic of the anabaptist crew would have said.'

Indeed it is a wonder, that since he knew that which he would insinuate (that there was no baptism of infants in the apostles' time) to be contrary to the sentiments of all the learned men in the world; he should so take it for granted on the ordinary pretences, without taking notice of what they say in answer. And that he should conclude, that in the next century of years, which passed from the apostles' to Tertullian's time, it was held and practised variously or indifferently; only because Tertullian spake against what was then done about it: when almost all learned men do take that opposition of his for no evidence that the delay of infants' baptism, or virgins' baptism, or widows' baptism, was then practised by any body, (neither does Tertullian pretend it was,) but only for an evidence that Tertullian was a man of a singular opinion in this, as well as in forty other things that were then practised or taught. Neither can Tertullian himself be well understood to have advised that delay, but only when there is no danger of death<sup>k</sup>, which in the case of infants is very seldom.

This annotator is also partial in the account he gives of the writers of this century: in that he mentions Tertullian, who wrote at the latter end of it, and gives his opinion against the ordinary  
 100. practice of pædobaptism; without taking any notice of  
 (A.D. 200.) Irenæus, who wrote in the middle of it, and speaks of infants, as being ordinarily baptized, or regenerated; or of Origen,  
 67 who was contemporary with Tertullian, and wrote but a  
 (A.D. 167) little after him; and who having travelled in all the  
 110. noted churches then in the world, speaks of their baptism  
 (A.D. 210.) both as being generally practised, and also appointed by the apostles.

It is plain that the place on which he there comments does shew that the baptism of infants was then looked on as undoubted, and  
 150. (as he would represent) that 'the doubt about it was  
 (A.D. 250.) 'then taken away,' or solved. For Fidus, who doubted whether they might be baptized before the eighth day, and St. Cyprian and his fellow bishops, who resolved that doubt, had both

<sup>i</sup> [See Fell's edition, part i. p. 125; and part ii. p. 159.]

<sup>k</sup> See the place, part i. chap. 4. § 5, 7.



of them taken it for undoubted, that they are to be baptized in infancy<sup>1</sup>.

This partiality shewn by him for the antipædobaptists' side, makes one have the less opinion of his fidelity in that alteration which he has made in their favour, in the text of Tertullian's book of baptism, in his edition thereof; which does much alter the sense, and of which I gave an account when I recited the placem. I, though I knew it was otherwise in Pamelius' edition, and that Pamelius testifies his edition to agree with Gaigneus' (who first published this book of Tertullian) in that place; yet was of opinion that so learned a man would not have altered the words without some good authority from the manuscripts; and I set them down accordingly. But since he quotes no manuscripts to confirm that alteration; and besides, shews himself otherwise to have such a bias: I do now think it were proper for learned men to examine better how much credit is to be given to that amendment, which makes Tertullian advise the delay of baptism *absolutely*, which in the first, and some following editions, was expressed, *except in case of necessity*. P. S. And I find already that Mr. Stennet, a learned antipædobaptist, is convinced that no credit is to be given to it. For he quotes the place as it stood in the former editions, 'Quid enim necesse est, si non tam necesse, sponsores,' &c. 'For what need is there, except in case of necessity, that godfathers,' &c. in his Answer to Mr. Russen, chap. iv. p. 76.

VI. There were no need of mentioning bishop Taylor among these, were it not for some importunate antipædobaptists, who cite him in this controversy against his will. He, in the times of the rebellion in England, (when the parliamentarians, though divided among themselves into several sects, did all join in oppressing those of the church of England,) wrote a treatise called, *The Liberty of Propheying*: in which he pleaded that they, how earnest soever they were in maintaining the truth of their opinions, yet ought to grant a toleration to those that differed from them; because many other opinions had at least a probability, such as might well sway the conscience of a great many honest inquirers after truth.

And among the rest he undertook<sup>n</sup> to shew how much might be said for two sorts of dissenters, the antipædobaptists and the papists: saying thus; 'These two are the most troublesome and most disliked: and by an account made of these we may make judgment what may be done towards others, whose errors are not apprehended of so great malignity.'

<sup>1</sup> See the place, part i. chap. 6. § 1, &c.

<sup>m</sup> Part i. chap. 4. § 8.

<sup>n</sup> Sect. 17. 18.

And in his plea for the antipædobaptists, though he there declares himself well satisfied with the principles of pædobaptism, of which he gives a summary account, and says, that he ‘takes the other ‘opinion to be an error;’ yet under pretence of reciting what may be said for that error, he draws up so elaborate a system of arguments against infant-baptism, and sets them forth to the utmost, by such advantage of style, that he is judged to have said more for the antipædobaptists than they were ever before able to say for themselves. And Dr. Hammond says, ‘It is the most diligent ‘collection, and the most exact scheme of the arguments against ‘infant-baptism, that he had ever met with°. And that he has ‘therein in such manner represented the arguments for and against ‘it, that the latter have seemed to many to be successful and ‘victoriousP.’

It is generally supposed that he did this with a politic intention (commonly practised by those of the church of Rome) to divide the adversaries of the church of England among themselves; and to that end put arguments into the mouths of one sect, in order to puzzle the others. A sort of prevaricating in the things of God, which few protestants or sincere Christians will account justifiable on any account whatever. Therefore Dr. Hammond, who was too great a lover of sincerity to approve of such a method, quickly wrote an answer to this piece, solving each objection particularlyq.

And afterward, bishop Taylor himself, having premised that he was sorry if any one had been so weak as to be misled by such mean objections, and that he counted it great charity and condescension in Dr. Hammond to bestow an answer on them, wrote also his own answers to his own objections, and inserted them in a later edition of the said treatise<sup>r</sup>; and in another treatise, called ‘The Consideration of the Church in baptizing the Children of Believers.’ He does also, in his ‘Great Exemplar,’ and in his *Ductor Dubitantium*<sup>s</sup>, expressly declare his opinion, and affirm, that ‘it is necessary ‘that infants be baptized;’ and reckons ‘infant-baptism, and the ‘keeping of the Lord’s day, among those things that are confirmed ‘by this rule.’

Whatsoever the catholic church has kept in all ages by-gone, may rightly be believed to have descended from the apostles.

° Six Queries, Infant Baptism, § 49.

P Ibid. § 139.

q [See his Letter of resolution to Six Queries; Qu. 4. sect. 49, to the end.—Hammond’s Works, vol. i.]

r [Viz. all which follows the clause

marked 33 in the folio editions; in some modern ones this portion is placed by itself, as an appendix.]

s Book ii. chap. 3. rule 14: § 41: also rule 18. § 1.

‘Which,’ he says, ‘is a good rule for rituals, [among which he reckons baptism,] though not for matter of doctrine.’ The reason of which distinction he had given before<sup>t</sup>. ‘Because there is no doctrine so delivered but what is in scripture: indeed some practices and rituals are. Because the public exercises and usages of the church being united and notorious, public and acted, might make the rule evident as the light.’

Notwithstanding all which, it is a common thing with the anti-pædobaptists to cite the passages in that treatise of the ‘Liberty of Prophesying’ that make for them, as if they had been spoken by the author from his own judgment, and had never been answered by him.

There is not much said either in the objections or answers about this point of antiquity: they being chiefly taken from scripture. What he has is mostly from Grotius.

He objects<sup>u</sup> that ‘all arguments from tradition are much decried by protestants in other cases, and therefore ought not to be made use of in this.’

To which Dr. Hammond and he answer, that ‘protestants did never renounce the arguments from tradition in general: but, on the contrary, whatever appears to be the tradition of the apostles, or to be the practice of the Christians in those first times, they willingly own. And that what they decry, is either the traditions of later times, or else the false pretences to the elder ones.’

He had objected likewise, that there is but a weak proof of any  
 110. such tradition, and that ‘whereas Origen says, that the  
 (A.D. 210.) ‘apostles gave order to the churches that they should  
 baptize their infants, and St. Austin says the same; yet that  
 290. ‘probably St. Austin took this from Origen’s writings:  
 (A.D. 390.) ‘and so it depends on Origen’s single testimony.’

At which rate of arguing, if forty had said it, one might pretend that probably thirty-nine of them had it from the first; and so there were but one single evidence.

But he, as well as Dr. Hammond, answers, that Irenæus, and the  
 67. author of the Questions in the name of Justin Martyr, and  
 (A.D. 167.) abundance of others, ‘(though they do not speak expressly, of the apostles appointing it, yet) do confirm it to have been the  
 274. ‘practice in those times.’ To which I have added a testi-  
 (A.D. 374.) mony of St. Ambrose<sup>x</sup>, that speaks expressly of the apostles’ times.

<sup>t</sup> See rule 14. § 38 to 44.

<sup>u</sup> Liberty of Prophesying, sect. 18. § 25.

<sup>x</sup> Part i. ch. 13. § 1.



The bishop also knew, or might have known, that St. Austin was no reader of Origen's works.

He objected, moreover, that pædobaptism was first established by canon of the Milevitan council, (as he calls it; meaning that canon <sup>318.</sup> of the council of Carthage, which I recited, part i. ch. 19. (A.D. 418.) § 37,) in the year of Christ, 418. So he dates it.

But both he and Hammond answer that, to this effect: that since it was the known custom of the primitive church, to make canons only about points that had been questioned by heretics; it is a great proof that this had never been questioned, (as St. Austin concludes it was from the beginning, because 'not instituted by councils,') for none can deny that it was a common practice long before.

And I think I have shewed it also to be a mistake to think that it was then decreed that infants should be baptized; whereas the decree was, that they are in a true meaning baptized for 'forgiveness of original sin,' (which the Pelagians denied; but their baptism they denied not,) and that they may be baptized before the eighth day, when newborn; of which some in Africa doubted.

He had also, in his plea for the antipædobaptists, cited the canon <sup>214.</sup> of the Neocæsarean council, which I recited, part i. ch. 8. (A.D. 314.) § 1, and had drawn from it reasons against infant-baptism, such as there rehearsed.

And the answer which he and Dr. Hammond make, is in substance the same that is there also given.

Yet after all this, this bishop is to be reckoned among the second sort, that I mentioned, of those that have denied the practice of infant-baptism to have been general or universal in the primitive times; as appears by his later works, which I shall have occasion to cite when I speak of that second sort of men.

VII. It is tedious to spend time in speaking of Dr. Barlow, the late bishop of Lincoln. What he had said on this subject, (of which the antipædobaptists do so serve themselves, that one shall see his name brought in twenty times by some one of their writers,) he himself fairly recanted.

He had, in those hopeful times that were in England, in the <sup>1556.</sup> year 1656, wrote a letter to Mr. Tombes, wherein he had (A.D. 1656.) said thus: 'I do believe pædobaptism (how, or by whom, I know not) came into the world in the second century; and in the third and fourth began to be practised (though not generally) and defended as lawful from the text grossly misunderstood, John iii. 5. Upon the like gross mistake of John vi. 53. they



‘ did for many centuries, both in the Greek and Latin church,  
 ‘ communicate infants, and give them the Lord’s Supper. And I  
 ‘ do confess they might do both as well as either.’

This letter being handed among the antipædobaptists came after-  
 ward to be printed<sup>z</sup>, to the said doctor’s discredit, who  
 (A.D. 1673.) was now Margaret professor in the university of Oxford,  
 and accounted a very learned man.

Therefore in the year 1675, he wrote a letter to Mr. Wills with  
 consent that it should be published, in which he says thus:  
 (A.D. 1675.) ‘ I acknowledge that such words as are cited by Mr. Dan-  
 ‘ vers (and such others, spoke and writ then, with more confidence  
 ‘ than judgment or discretion) are in that letter; which had been  
 ‘ *secret still*, if some had not betrayed that trust which was reposed  
 ‘ in them. Lastly, it is to be considered, that that letter was writ  
 ‘ about twenty years ago, (when I talked more, and understood less,)  
 ‘ and yet whatever doubts or objections I had then against infant-  
 ‘ baptism, I never thought them so considerable as to warrant any  
 ‘ division, or schismatical disturbance of the peace of my mother the  
 ‘ church of England. And therefore I did then, and since, and  
 ‘ (when I have a just call, God willing) ever shall, baptize infants<sup>a</sup>.’

VIII. I am unwilling to name Bilius<sup>b</sup> among these: because I  
 believe that was not his steady opinion, which may seem to be the  
 most obvious sense of an expression of his in his commentary on the  
 nineteenth oration of Gregory Nazianzen; where there is an account  
 of the baptism of the said Gregory’s father, which was after his  
 marriage. And Bilius there speaking of the danger of sinning after  
 baptism, says; ‘ I mention this, because in those times persons  
 ‘ came later to baptism than nowadays; when by a commendable  
 ‘ custom they are baptized in infancy, lest delay should bring  
 ‘ danger with it.’

What a word did that learned abbot suffer to escape the hedge of  
 his lips? Was not that Gregory the father a heathen till that time,  
 and his parents before him? I believe if one were to look over  
 Bilius’ writings, one should find that this was not his settled  
 opinion. But I have not time to do that at present.

Since the first edition of this book, one Antony van Dale<sup>c</sup>, a

<sup>z</sup> In ‘Danvers’ Treatise of Baptism,  
 cent. 4. [Part i. chap. 7. p. 63.]

<sup>a</sup> Wills’ Infant Baptism farther vindicated, p. 88. 8vo. 1675.

<sup>b</sup> [Jacques de Billi, a learned French  
 abbot of the sixteenth century, distinguished himself by a Latin version of the  
 works of Gregory Nazianzen, which was  
 published under his own eye in 1569,

again in 1570, 1583, &c. and is retained  
 in Morell’s edition, Paris 1609, and 1630.

The note, or scholion, referred to in the  
 text, may be found at p. 129. of the  
 edition of 1570. No. 14.]

<sup>c</sup> [See Antonii Van Dale dissertatio  
 super Aristeæ de lxx. Interpretibus: ad-  
 ditur Historia Baptismorum. 4to. Amstel.  
 1705.]

Dutch Minnist or antipædobaptist, has written a tract called, *The History of Baptisms*. Wherein he has one chapter against infant-baptism: and in that [at p. 375] a quotation of a letter of Salmasius, written to Justus Pacius under the name of Simplicius Verinus. Where Salmasius says; ‘In the first two centuries none received baptism, but such as being instructed in the faith, and made acquainted with the doctrine of Christ, could declare their belief of it; because of those words, *He that believeth and is baptized: so that believing is to be the first.* Thence was the order of catechumens in the church. There was then also a constant custom, that to those catechumens, presently after their baptism, the eucharist should be given. Afterward there came in an opinion, that none could be saved that was not baptized. And so there grew a custom of giving baptism to infants. And because the adult catechumens, as soon as they were baptized, had the eucharist given them, without any space of time passing between; it was, after that infant-baptism was brought in, ordered that this should be done also with infants.’

Having not any copy of Salmasius’ letters, I can judge nothing of the authenticalness<sup>d</sup> of this quotation; nor can give any guess (if Salmasius did write such a letter) what age he might be of when he wrote it, or whether he published it himself. I know that many learned men have suffered much in their memory by having all their letters and posthumous pieces printed after their death: some whereof were such, as being written in their youth, they themselves would have been ashamed of afterward, and would, upon better information and reading, have recanted: an instance whereof I gave just now, in one that in his youth wrote a letter so like this, that one may seem to be drawn from the other. And I have also known several persons who have owned, that before their reading the ancient books, they have been inclined to such an opinion against the antiquity of infant-baptism, as is expressed in these two letters; but afterward found their own mistake. And this is the more probable in the case of Salmasius, for that he never did in his conversation or books (that I ever heard of) shew any inclination

<sup>d</sup> [The letter alluded to in the text was published under the following title, ‘*De transubstantiatione liber, Simplicio Verino Auctore. Ad Justum Pacium contra H. Grotium. Hagiopoli, 1646.*’ 8vo. Salmasius was then fifty-eight years of age, having been born in 1588. The passage quoted occurs at p. 494, and is fairly given by Van Dale.

It should be remarked, that there are

two distinct works by Salmasius, both published under the same feigned name, both in the same year, both directed against Grotius, and both addressed ‘ad Justum Pacium:’ but the earlier of the two calls itself *epistola*, and the latter *liber*: (in this particular Van Dale has mistaken, and might lead an inquirer astray;) and that it is the *second* work which Dr. Wall here recites.]

to antipædobaptism. But if this were his steady opinion concerning the beginning of pædobaptism; then we must add him to those three or four men that have said this without giving any proof from antiquity of their saying.

I find this very passage quoted by Mr. Stennet [Answer to Russen, p. 86] as from *Suicerus' Thesaurus, sub voce Σύραξ*<sup>e</sup>. Who it seems took it from Salmasius.

IX. There is, as I said, another sort of learned men, who, though they think with the rest of the world, that infant-baptism was ever practised in the church of Christ, yet think that it was not general or universal; but that in the elder times some Christian parents baptized their children in infancy, and others not: and that it was counted indifferent.

I take Grotius to be the author of this opinion. For though some before him did observe that many persons of note in the primitive times were baptized at man's age, some of whom they took to be born of Christian parents, (which last, whether they did not take to be so without due examination, shall be discoursed afterward,) yet they supposed them to be not enough to make any considerable exception to the general rule and practice of the church.

So though Dr. Field, in his treatise *Of the Church*<sup>f</sup>, do say, that 'besides those who were converted from paganism, many that were 'born of Christian parents, put off their baptism a long time:' an instance of which he makes St. Ambrose: yet these (whom he calls many) he takes to be so few in comparison, that he still speaks of the other as a 'continued practice' or tradition. As where he treats purposely of tradition<sup>g</sup>, he says:

'The fourth kind of tradition is the *continued practice* of such 'things, as neither are contained in the scripture expressly, nor the 'example of such practice expressly there delivered; though the 'grounds, reasons, and causes of the necessity of such practice be 'there contained; and the benefit or good that followeth of it. Of 'this sort is the baptism of infants,' &c.

But Grotius from this and some other arguments frames an hypothesis of the indifferency (*libertas* he calls it) of the ancient church in this matter<sup>h</sup>. And though Rivet do suppose that Grotius was a convert of cardinal Perron in this point; for the said cardinal in his *Reply to King James* had (as Rivet<sup>i</sup> observes) 'pleaded the

<sup>e</sup> [See col. 1136, tom. ii. edit. 1728.]

<sup>f</sup> Page 719.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. iv. cap. 20.

<sup>h</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

<sup>i</sup> Apology. [8vo. Lugd. Bat. 1643. and in vol. iii. of Riveti Opera Theologica, p. 1076.]



‘cause of the anabaptists with all his might : and I see,’ says Rivet, ‘that he has brought over Hugo Grotius.’—Yet I count it proper to reckon Grotius as the author, because what the Cardinal had said was very probably not from his real opinion, but from a design to embroil the protestants, by giving strength to the schism of the antipædobaptists, who then began to grow rife in Holland and other places. A design which the papists have since earnestly promoted ; industriously putting it into their books, that infant-baptism cannot be proved from scripture, but only from the practice of the church : and as some of them will have it, not from any evidence of the practice of the ancient church neither, but only from the authority of the present church.

I am not willing to think that Grotius had so ill a design. But he being naturally inclined to trim all controversies in religion that came in his way, and using that vast stock of learning which he had (as princes that would hold the balance do their power) to help the weakest side, he maintains (not that there was ever any church or any time in which infant-baptism was not used, but) that in the Greek churches, many ‘persons, from the beginning to this day, do ‘observe the custom of delaying the baptism of their infants till ‘they are able to make confession of their own faith<sup>i</sup>.’

The mistake that he is here guilty of in reference to the modern practice of the Greek churches, in which (as all men are now sure) there neither is, nor lately has been, any such thing known as the delay of infants’ baptism, (especially if he mean the Greek churches properly so called ; for what dispute is raised concerning the Georgian Christians I do mention hereafter<sup>k</sup>.) makes one take less notice of what he affirms concerning the ancient practice thereof. As he produces no proof at all of what he says of the late times, so what he urges for this indifferency of the elder times consists in these particulars.

<sup>214.</sup> He cites the canon of the council of Neocæsarea, mentioned above<sup>l</sup>, and expounds it to make against infant-baptism.

But this, if it proves any thing, proves too much : not a liberty, <sup>300.</sup> but an unlawfulness of infant-baptism in the opinion of (A.D. 400.) those seventeen bishops. He himself says, that ‘it is ‘plain that in St. Austin’s time pædobaptism was received in all ‘churches ; because the Pelagians being pressed with that as an ‘argument never could deny it.’ And was it not obvious likewise for him to observe, that the Pelagians being pressed with this argu-

<sup>i</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

<sup>k</sup> Ch. 8. § 2.

<sup>l</sup> Part i. ch. 8. § 1.



ment, 'That no Christian ever was against pædobaptism,' could not deny it, but expressly granted it<sup>m</sup>? And could Pelagius and St.

<sup>214.</sup> Austin too have forgot, that a council of seventeen bishops (A.D. 314.) had determined against it but eighty years before, if they or any body else had at that time gathered any such meaning out of their words? The pædobaptists say, that this meaning lay hid for 1300 years after the men were dead, till he picked it out. But of this, and of the use that he makes of the words of Balsamon and Zonaras thereupon, was discoursed before<sup>n</sup>.

He observes also, that 'in the councils one shall find no earlier <sup>318.</sup> 'mention of pædobaptism than in the council of Carthage.' (A.D. 418.) From whence he would infer, that 'it did not universally 'obtain, but was more frequent in Africa than any where else.'

And St. Austin, as was above cited<sup>o</sup>, proves that it must have been instituted by the apostles; because it did and ever had universally obtained, and yet was not instituted by any council. Mentioned it was by a council under St. Cyprian<sup>p</sup>, which did not enact it, but take it for granted.

I mentioned before<sup>q</sup> his other argument, which is nothing else <sup>150.</sup> but the perverting of the sense of a few words of Gregory (A.D. 250.) Nazianzen, (where he, speaking of several sorts of persons that die without baptism, names among the rest 'those that are not 'baptized διὰ νηπιότητα, by reason of infancy,') as if Nazianzen had thereby intimated his opinion to be, that infancy did incapacitate one for baptism. Whereas if the reader please to turn back to part I. ch. 11. § 6, where I have cited the place at large, he will see that Nazianzen there reckons 'those who are not baptized [or have 'missed of baptism] by reason of their infancy,' among those whose own fault it is not, that they are not baptized; and therefore their punishment shall be less in the world to come.

The most material thing that he brings, is the instance of Gregory Nazianzen and St. Chrysostom, born, as he takes it, of Christian parents, and yet not baptized till of age. Which shall be discussed in the next chapter.

He concludes, 'that all that he has brought is of no force to prove 'that infant-baptism should be denied; but only to shew *libertatem*, ' *vetustatem*, *et consuetudinis differentiam*, the liberty, antiquity, and 'difference of the custom.'

X. I said before, that bishop Taylor is to be reckoned in this

<sup>m</sup> See part i. ch. 19. § 30.

<sup>n</sup> Part i. ch. 8. § 6, 7.

<sup>o</sup> Part i. ch. 15. sect. 4. § 3.

<sup>p</sup> Cypriani Epist. ad Fidum.

<sup>q</sup> Part i. ch. 11. § 9.

rank; if one knows where to reckon him, or can reconcile what I have quoted from him, with that which I am going to quote.

He, in his ‘Dissuasive from Popery,’ one of his latest works, being busy in defending the protestant doctrine against the papists, who plead the necessity of tradition to prove infant-baptism; and having answered, that it is proved enough from scripture as to the lawfulness of it, goes on to shew that tradition does not do so much service in the matter; for that it delivers it to us as the custom of ‘some Christians in all times, but not of all.’ His words are these:

‘At the first they did, or they did not, according as they pleased; for there is no pretence of tradition, that the church in all ages did baptize all the infants of Christian parents. It is more certain that they did not do it always, than that they did it in the first age. St. Ambrose, St. Hierome, and St. Austin, were born of Christian parents, and yet not baptized until the full age of a man, and more.’

And a little after, ‘That it was the custom so to do in some churches, and at some times, is without all question; but that there is a tradition from the apostles so to do, relies but upon two

<sup>110.</sup> witnesses, Origen and St. Austin: and the latter having (A.D. 210.) ‘received it from the former, it relies wholly upon his <sup>296.</sup> (A.D. 396.) ‘single testimony; which is but a pitiful argument to prove a tradition apostolical. He is the first that spoke it: but

<sup>100.</sup> ‘Tertullian, that was before him, seems to speak against (A.D. 200.) ‘it; which he would not have done, if it had been a <sup>1422.</sup> (A.D. 1522.) ‘tradition apostolical. And that it was not so, is but too ‘certain, if there be any truth in the words of Ludovicus Vives<sup>s</sup>.’

And then he recites what was above cited out of Lud. Vives<sup>t</sup>.

The most of this is what he said before<sup>u</sup>, and on which I did before make what remarks are necessary: as I shall do in the next chapter, on what he says of Ambrose, Hierome, Austin, born of Christian parents, and yet not baptized in infancy. From the whole, one may here see some of the workings of that singular fancy that this bishop had about original sin. I forgot when I saw his ‘Dissuasive from Popery,’ to look at the date of the edition of it, and to see if it were not a posthumous one<sup>x</sup>: which I suspect, because what he says in it of this indifferency, is contrary to what I quoted before (§ 6.) out of his ‘Great Exemplar’ and ‘Ductor

<sup>r</sup> Part ii. lib. i. sect. 3. p. 117. [edit. 4to. Lond. 1667: which was the earliest impression of the second part of this work.]

<sup>s</sup> Page 118.

<sup>t</sup> See § 3.

<sup>u</sup> See § 6.

<sup>x</sup> [Bishop Taylor died in 1667. The edition referred to was published in that year, but after the bishop's death.]

‘*Dubitantium*,’ and is more agreeable to what he had said in his youth, but afterward recanted.

XI. Mr. Thorndyke also, in the third book of his ‘*Epilogue*,’ (which is of the ‘*Laws of the Church*,’) yields, that the eastern church, (though they held infant-baptism necessary in case of the danger of death,) yet did sometimes defer it when there was no such danger. But that the western church enjoined it, as the present church does, to be given presently.

He, as well as Grotius, Taylor, &c., seems to be moved to this concession by the instances of Nazianzen, Nectarius, &c., baptized at man’s age; of which I shall speak in the next chapter, and shew the most of them to be mistakes.

XII. Monsieur Daillé has also something to this purpose. He says<sup>z</sup>, ‘In ancient times they often deferred the baptizing both of infants and of other people; as appears by the history of the emperors, Constantine the Great, of Constantius, of Theodosius, of Valentinian, and Gratian, out of St. Ambrose: and also by the orations and homilies of Gregory Nazianzen<sup>a</sup>, and also of St. Basil<sup>b</sup>, on this subject. And some of the Fathers too have been of opinion that it is fit it should be deferred, as namely, Tertullian, as we have formerly noted out of him.’

I shall have occasion, in the next chapter, to discourse concerning those instances of the emperors. And whereas he speaks of the delay of the baptism of infants and other people, it is fit for the reader to observe, that the orations which he cites, are indeed a proof that many grown people converted did put off their baptism a long time; because those orations or sermons are made on purpose to convince people of their sin and danger in so doing. But there is nothing in them that gives any evidence, that those who were once baptized themselves, did ever delay the baptizing of their children: save that in one of them Gregory Nazianzen gives his opinion, that in case the children are in good health, and there be no fear of their death, one may do well to defer their baptism till they be about three years old; but otherwise, to baptize them out of hand. The place I have set down at large, part 1. ch. 11. § 7.

XIII. Mr. Baxter also, who has shewn a great deal of zeal, and spent a great deal of pains in maintaining the cause of pædobaptism,

<sup>y</sup> An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England; being a necessary consideration and brief resolution of the chief controversies in Religion that divide the Western Church: occasioned by the present calamity of the Church of England. In three books: by Herbert

Thorndyke, folio, London, 1659.]

<sup>z</sup> De Usu Patrum, lib. ii. c. 6. [p. 329, edit. Genev. 1656.]

<sup>a</sup> Orat. 40.

<sup>b</sup> Εἰς βαπτισμὸν προτρεπτικῇ. [Op. tom. ii. p. 113. edit. Benedict.]

yet when he is in a complying humour, allows thus much: 'That in the days of Tertullian, Nazianzen, and Augustine, men had liberty to be baptized, or to bring their children, when, and at what age they pleased; and none were forced to go against their consciences.' And that 'he knows not that our rule or religion is changed: or that we are grown any wiser or better than they<sup>c</sup>.'

The days of Tertullian and Nazianzen are pitched on, I suppose, because of their sayings, which have been mentioned. The days of Austin have no reason to be brought in here; but only because Mr. Baxter thought that his parents were Christians, (a mistake common to him with many others,) and that, they not baptizing him in infancy, it was probable that many other Christians omitted it likewise.

The same thing, as I hear, is maintained by those Remonstrants that are authors of *Censura Censuræ*<sup>d</sup>, in their 23rd chapter.

XIV. Since the writing of the rest, I find that Garnier the Jesuit is, or would seem to be, of this opinion; by what he says in his notes upon a sermon of Nestorius, published with Mercator's works: 'In those old times baptism was not given presently after the birth, as it is now: but was many times deferred a great while; not only by the adults, (who came to it at their own time,) but also by the parents of infants, till they were grown up<sup>e</sup>.'

This race of men at first pretended to no more than this; that infant-baptism cannot be proved from scripture, without having recourse to the proof that is taken from the practice of the ancient church. And this they did, that they might force the protestants to own the traditions of the ancient church to be necessary in determining points of religion; for that without them the protestants could not defend their cause against the anti-pædobaptists. But now that the protestants have largely shewn that that recourse to the traditions of the ancient church does turn the scale on the protestants' side against the papists; and that they find it necessary for their cause to decry both scripture and the traditions of the ancient church, as being both of them together insufficient; and that we must throw ourselves on the authority of the present church, i. e. the church of Rome: they do, in order to force this down, set their wits to maintain that infant-baptism cannot be proved, neither

<sup>c</sup> Defence of the Principles of Love, p. 7. 8vo. 1671.

<sup>d</sup> [The book alluded to, but incorrectly named by Dr. Wall, is entitled, 'Apologia pro Confessione sive Declaratione Sententiæ eorum qui in federato Belgio

'vocantur Remonstrantes, contra Censuram quatuor professorum Leidensium.' 4to. (sine loco) 1629. The passage referred to occurs at p. 252, 254, and bears out the statement of the text.]

<sup>e</sup> Part i. p. 79. edit. 1673.



from scripture, nor from the primitive practice, but only by the infallibility of the present church.

But, as such subtle men do sometimes forget themselves, especially if they be voluminous authors; this same Jesuit, in his notes on another book, says, ‘When the apostle writes to the Romans, of whom several had been baptized in infancy, and yet says, *So many of us as have been baptized into Christ Jesus, have been baptized into his death*, &c., under those general words he comprehends those that were baptized before the use of reason<sup>f</sup>.’ By making some that were grown men at the time of this epistle, viz. twenty-three years after Christ’s death, to have been baptized at Rome in their infancy, he supposes infant-baptism there practised as soon as the gospel can be reckoned to have been preached there, and perhaps (if we compute the times) sooner.

Mr. Danvers, book i. ch. 7<sup>g</sup>, produces one Boemus, who should say, that in the Christian church, and Mr. Stennet, ‘Answer to ‘Russen,’ p. 85, one Macaire, who should say, that in the church of Alexandria, no infants were in the first ages baptized. It is the unhappiness of vulgar readers, that if they see a strange name quoted, they think it a great authority: but it is a very disingenuous thing to take advantage of this their weakness. It is like putting off bad wares upon ignorant chapmen. For Boemus, I could never hear who he was, nor when he lived. (P. S. I find, since the first edition,

656. that he is a late author of no note or regard for learning.)  
(A D. 756). Macaire (as Mr. Stennet says) was bishop of Memphis in Egypt<sup>h</sup>, anno 756. But we have no account from him, how or when this new-found book of his came to light, or how it appears to be genuine. This is certain, that at that time there was no such place as Memphis; and that the Saracens had above a hundred years before that overrun all Egypt, whose custom was to destroy all Christian books and learning. And can we think that this unknown man, in such a time of ignorance, is able to tell us any news of the primitive practice, which Origen (who lived in Alexandria five or six hundred years before that) and the other Fathers who had a clear light of history to their own times, had never heard

<sup>f</sup> Notes on the 9th chapter of Mercator’s Subnotations, p. 63. part i. edit. 1673.

<sup>g</sup> [Cent. xii. p. 73. edit. 1674. The author produced is Joannes Boemus Aubanus, calling himself ‘Sacerdos Teutonicæ militiæ devotus,’ who published a work entitled, ‘Omnium gentium Mores, Leges, et Ritus, ex multis clarissimis rerum scriptoribus collecti.’ folio, Augustæ

Vindel. 1520: (reprinted in 1537, again in 1604.) The passage given (but not fairly) by Danvers occurs at chapter 12 of the second book, fol. 37 in the edition of 1520.]

<sup>h</sup> [And secretary to Cosmus III. the 58th patriarch of Alexandria: Mr. Stennet quotes from Vansleb’s ‘Histoire de l’Eglise d’Alexandrie,’ part i. c. 23.]

of? Such authors serve only to fill up a crowd of names, and to put an abuse upon a plain honest reader: the prevention of which is my only excuse for mentioning these, who are by no means to be reckoned among learned men.

There is also a passage in the former English editions of Camden's '*Britannia*,' which, if every reader knew who is the author of it, would for the same reason have no need of being mentioned here. But many readers take all that is there put into the text, for Camden's own: whereas Dr. Holland the translator has inserted abundance of his own additions. And, among the rest, he has in Cumberland interpolated among Camden's words, a fancy of his own against the antiquity of infant-baptism. Camden is there speaking of the font at Bridekirk in that county, 'Which is,' he says, 'a large open vessel of greenish stone, with several little images curiously engraven on it;' having also an inscription which he could not read. He guesses it to have been made originally for a font, (to which use it is still employed, and (to account for the images engraven on it) he says, 'We read that the fonts were 'anciently adorned with the pictures of holy men, whose lives were 'proposed as a pattern to such as were baptized;' for which he quotes in the margin Paulinus. Then follows in the text this addition of Dr. Holland's: 'For in the first plantation of Christianity amongst the Gentiles, such only as were of full age, after 'they were instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, 'were admitted to baptism.'

Camden's words, quoted from Paulinus, do intimate no more than this; that there were in ancient times many baptisms of adult persons; but that such only were admitted, is said only by Dr. Holland, who seems to have concluded it too hastily from what Camden quoted.

But it appears since by a more accurate view taken by the present bishop of Carlisle<sup>i</sup> of the inscription, and of those which Camden calls images on the said font-stone, that the contrary to what Dr. Holland thought is proved from them. For he, in a letter to sir William Dugdale, (printed in the additions to the last edition of that book,) explains both the inscription and the images: by which latter he says, 'We have there fairly represented a person in a long 'sacerdotal habit, dipping a child into the water; and a dove ' (the emblem, no doubt, of the Holy Ghost) hovering over the 'infant,' &c.

XV. Of the professed antipædobaptists, (for all that I have yet

<sup>i</sup> [Dr. W. Nicholson. See above, Part i. chap. 3. § 9. p. 54. and the note there.]

mentioned were pædobaptists, notwithstanding some of their sayings concerning the ancient use,) Mr. Tombes was a man of the best parts in our nation, and perhaps in any; but his talent did not lie much in ancient history or reading. All that I have seen of his of this nature has been considered, in speaking of the authors to whom he refers<sup>k</sup>.

Mr. Danvers has heaped together a vast rhapsody of quotations<sup>l</sup>; but having seldom consulted the authors themselves, but taken them at second hand, and out of any sort of writers, such as he calls by the names of Twisk<sup>m</sup>, Frank<sup>n</sup>, &c., and a book called Dutch Martyrology, &c., books of no kind of credit, he has for the most part strangely misrepresented them.

He was publicly accused by Mr. Baxter<sup>o</sup>, and Mr. Wills<sup>p</sup>, for a wilful forger of quotations; and the book would tempt one to think so. But upon second thoughts, I hope it was partly his authors, and partly want of good heed or skill that misled him. Mr. Wills went so far as to put in an appeal to his own party against him, that they ought to renounce him: and he printed it. But he and they answered as well as they could, and made the best of a bad matter. And indeed Mr. Wills in that appeal (for want of books I suppose) made not his best advantage of the charge that might have been brought against him: for he instanced in some of his false quotations that were of the least consequence; omitting those of greater, and such as it had been impossible for him or them to reconcile: and also in some of them was mistaken himself.

Most of the rest of them do, as much as may be, avoid speaking of the practice of the primitive church, and do except against any argument brought from thence as a human authority. A method, which, if they be resolved to continue in their opinion, is much for their purpose; provided they meet with adversaries so weak as to let it so pass over.

XVI. I have produced all the modern learned men that I know

<sup>k</sup> Part i. ch. 4. §. 8. ch. 5. § 7. ch. 6. § 1, 2, &c. ch. 21. § 5, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Treatise of Baptism.

<sup>m</sup> [Mr. Danvers frequently cites as authority 'Twisk Chronic. p. &c.' What book that is, I have not yet been able to ascertain.]

<sup>n</sup> [Sebastian Frank, a fanatical author of the sixteenth century; who, among sundry strange and paradoxical works, published a 'Chronicle, Annals, and History of the Bible,' first printed in 1531, and reprinted in 1536, 1538, 1543, 1585.]

<sup>o</sup> Confutation of the strange Forgeries

of H. Danvers, [being the second part of his 'More Proofs of Infants,' &c. 80. 1675.]

<sup>p</sup> [See 'Infant-baptism asserted and vindicated by Scripture and Antiquity; in answer to a treatise of baptism lately published by Mr. Henry Danvers: together with a full detection of his misrepresentations, &c. by Obed. Wills, 'M.A.' 80. 1674. Also, 'Vindiciæ Vindiciarum,' &c. and 'An Appeal to the Baptists, against Mr. Danvers, &c. by the same.' 80. 1675.]



of, that have thought that infant-baptism either was not from the beginning, or was not universal. And though I proposed to manage impartially, yet I hope no reader that is a pædobaptist will expect that I should do the like with those learned men that give their verdict for it. Instead of that, I must declare that all the rest that I have seen, that have occasion to speak of this matter, are of opinion, that the sayings of the Fathers are a sufficient evidence that it was always in use, and that as the general practice of the church of Christ.

Indeed they will many of them say thus : that there may perhaps be produced here and there a singular instance of a person, that did omit it through carelessness, or some accident, &c., and that Tertulian also is an instance of one man that advised the delay of it till the age of reason, in case there appeared no danger of death in the meantime : and that this is ordinary in all customs, however allowed and established, that some one in an age happens to speak or act against them : and that a few such straggling instances are not to be esteemed of force sufficient to weaken the authority of a general rule.

But it seems to me that the instances which the antipædobaptists give, of persons not baptized in infancy, though born of Christians, are not (if the matter of fact be true) so inconsiderable as this last plea would represent.

On the contrary, the persons they mention are so many, and such noted persons ; that, (if they be all allowed,) it is an argument that leaving children unbaptized was no unusual, but a frequent and ordinary thing. For it is obvious to conclude, that if we can in so remote an age trace the practice of so many that did this ; it is probable that a great many more, of whose birth and baptism we do not read, did the like. This I will own, that it seems to me the argument of greatest weight of any that is brought on the antipædobaptists' side in this dispute about antiquity. And I believe the reader has observed in the places I have last quoted, that it is that which has most prevailed, both with Strabo and Vives, to think it was once the general practice to leave infants unbaptized ; and with Grotius, bishop Taylor, and the others, to think it was once counted indifferent. It deserves therefore not to be so slightly passed over ; but if one had time and opportunity, to be thoroughly examined.

The worst is, it is a business of a great deal of dust and tediousness, to search after the birth and parentage of so many men, (who, though they were conspicuous persons, yet many of them sprang from obscure originals,) and not to be well done by any who has



not a good library at hand. I have in my reading taken some observations of this matter, which I shall communicate in the next chapter.

---

### CHAP. III.

*Of those who are said to have been born of Christian parents, and yet not baptized till of man's age.*

Sect. I. An account of the persons, and state of their case.

I. THE instances of this that are commonly given, are the five emperors mentioned before by Mr. Daillé, viz. Constantine, Constantius, Gratian, Valentinian the Second, and Theodosius the First, and also four noted persons of the Greek church, viz. St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, Neectarius, and St. Chrysostom; and three of the Latin, St. Ambrose, St. Hierome, and St. Austin. Mr. Tombes mentions also Alypius and Adeodatus; one the friend, and the other the base son, of St. Austin: and both baptized at the same time with him.

Many of the pædobaptists make but weak answers to the argument that is drawn from the example of these men. They content themselves to say, that it was from some erroneous or corrupt principles, that many in those times thought fit to defer baptism a great while; and some till just before death: either that they might gain a longer time for their lusts, or because they thought that wilful sins committed after baptism could not be forgiven.

That many new converts did do this, is too plain; and is a thing grievously complained of by the preachers of those times: and the granting of it to be true does not at all affect the question in hand; which is not, whether adult persons did defer their own baptism: but whether such adult persons as were come to a full resolution of being Christians, and were accordingly baptized themselves, did use to baptize their children in infancy or not. And to grant this latter, that they who were once baptized, did frequently use to let their children grow up without baptism, is to weaken, in great measure, the argument for infant-baptism that is drawn from the practice of these ancients. For if many did omit it, though upon erroneous grounds, the argument from the general practice is lost.

But some others have attempted a better answer, by shewing these instances, or some of them, to be mistakes: and that not all the persons mentioned were born of Christian parents; particularly Constantine and Austin have been excepted; as it was indeed easy

to shew that those two ought to be. I shall make some particular search concerning each of them.

And the thing to be inquired concerning each of them, is ;

1st, Whether his baptism were delayed till years of age. And if so, then,

2dly, Whether his parents were baptized Christians at the time of his birth. I say, baptized : because it was, as I said before, a very common thing for men in those times to be Christians in their intention, and in their conscience, i. e. they were convinced that that was the truth, and did resolve some time or other to be baptized into it ; and yet did put this off from time to time, (as lukewarm men do nowadays their repentance, or their receiving the other sacrament,) knowing that baptism would engage them to a very strict course of life. And in this state many lived for a long time after their conversion : being in some sense Christians, i. e. they declared for that religion as the truth, they favoured it, they spoke for it, and in many things lived according to the rules of it ; but for all that, were not as yet baptized, and so not accounted, in the phrase of those times, *fideles*, faithful, or brethren.

These men, while they were in this state, had oftentimes children born to them : and for such, it cannot be expected that they should bring their children to baptism, before they could find in their heart to be baptized themselves.

Also many such children, (being not baptized in their infancy, because their parents, though believers, were not yet baptized,) when they grew up, delayed their baptism, as their fathers had done ; and so the mischief was continued. To these it often happened that they were instructed from their youth in the Christian religion, and yet not baptized. Of such St. Basil speaks in the place cited, part i. ch. 12. § 3, 4.

Therefore you see I had reason to say that our inquiry is of infants born of parents that were at that time baptized Christians. And that is all that any pædobaptist would have to be done now, viz. that when any man is baptized himself, he should baptize his infant children.

Mr. Walker, endeavouring to shew that the instances brought by the antipædobaptists do them no service, because the ancients that delayed their children's baptism, did it not on the same principles that they do now, viz. of the unlawfulness of it ; reckons up several reasons which moved some formerly to delay the baptism of their children : whereof the first is doubtless a plain and true one, viz. ' That some were as yet heathens themselves, when their children

‘ were born ; and no marvel if they would not make their children ‘ Christians,’ &c. And the same is the case of such as, though in ‘ heart and purpose Christians when their children were born, yet ‘ kept off from being baptized<sup>q</sup>.’ But he gives three reasons more, for which some that were baptized themselves might delay the baptizing of their children.

Any reader would, from what he says, conclude or suspect that many did this ; at least that for these three reasons there were an account of three persons that had done it. But upon search, I believe, it will appear that there is no proof of so many as three ; and that there is but one, viz. the father of Gregory Nazianzen, that makes an instance for this : and he not a plain one ; for it depends on an obscure point in chronology, whether the son were born before his father’s Christianity, or after ?

In making this inquiry, I shall begin with emperors. Of whom it is proper to note, that whereas Mr. Daillé having, as I cited before, spoke of the frequent deferring the baptism of children and of other people, names the emperors ; I suppose he means them among the *other* people, not among the children whose baptism was deferred. For all take him to be a man of another pitch of reading, than that he should think Constantine’s father, for example, to have been a Christian. But the antipædobaptists take this from him ; and they understand it so, and do very tenaciously maintain that it was so.

§ 2. Of Constantine and Constantius his son ; that they were not born of baptized parents.

I. That Constantine was not baptized in infancy, but, on the contrary, in his old age, is a plain case. Eusebius, who was familiar with him, tells us<sup>r</sup> when and how it was, viz. that when he thought himself near death, he went to Nicomedia, and having assembled the bishops in the suburbs of that city, ‘ he spoke thus to them ;’

‘ This is the time which I have long expected, with earnest desire  
237. ‘ and prayers, to obtain the salvation of God. It is time  
(A. D. 337.) ‘ that I also should enjoy the badge of immortality ; time  
‘ that I should be made partaker of the seal of salvation. I pur-  
‘ posed once to receive it in the waters of the river Jordan, in which  
‘ our Saviour is recorded to have been baptized for our example.  
‘ But God, who knows what is fittest for me, is pleased to grant it  
‘ me now in this place. Therefore let me not be delayed : for if he

<sup>q</sup> Preface to Modest Plea for Infants’ Baptism.

<sup>r</sup> De Vita Constantini, lib. iv. c. 62.

‘ that is Lord both of life and death, be pleased to continue my life  
 ‘ in this world, and if he have determined that I shall any longer  
 ‘ hold assemblies with the people of God, and shall once in the  
 ‘ church communicatè in the prayers together with the congrega-  
 ‘ tion; I will henceforward keep myself to such courses of life  
 ‘ as become a servant of God.’

‘ This he spake. And they performing the ceremonies, put in  
 ‘ execution the Divine ordinance, and made him partaker of the  
 ‘ unspeakable gift, requiring of him the professions that are usual.  
 ‘ And so Constantine, the only man of all the emperors that ever  
 ‘ were, being regenerated by Christ’s ordinance, was initiated; and  
 ‘ being made partaker of the Divine seal, he rejoiced in spirit,  
 ‘ and was renewed and filled with the Divine light,’ &c.

It is not material to mention the story which Nicephorus<sup>s</sup>, a thousand years after, sets on foot; that he was baptized at Rome, by Pope Sylvester, near the beginning of his reign: because it is all one to our purpose. Baronius<sup>t</sup> greedily embraces this latter account; I suppose, because it makes for the credit of the church of Rome, and helps to dress up the fable of the donation. But Perron, Petavius, and others forsake him in this, as being too improbable, since it was so lately invented.

II. But since both by the one and the other of these accounts he was not baptized in infancy; we must inquire of the religion of his parents; and first of his father Constantius Chlorus.

To think that Constantine, whose name all people, both learned and unlearned, remember by the token that he was the first Christian emperor, (at least of his race,) should have a Christian emperor to his father, does appear so great and so palpable a blunder; that any one would pass a severe censure on it, were it not that the learned Camden has let drop an expression sounding that way. He having occasion, in his account of the city of York, to speak of Constantius, the father of Constantine, calls him ‘ an excellent emperor, endowed  
 ‘ with all moral and Christian virtues,——after his death deified, as  
 ‘ appears by the old coins<sup>u</sup>.’

The latter part of this sentence does not suffer one to think that Camden did in the former part of it mean that Constantius was really a Christian, but only that he favoured the Christians, and had himself virtues something like those of a good Christian;) for Christian emperors were not often deified by the heathens. And

<sup>s</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. c. 33.

<sup>t</sup> Ad annum 324.

<sup>u</sup> [Camden’s *Britannia*, by Gibson,

p. 880, edit. 1722.—Vol. ii. p. 99. edit. 1772.—Compare Gough’s edition, fol. 1789, vol. iii. p. 10.]



accordingly, when Fuller<sup>x</sup> had, in his 'Church History,' at the year 305, reflected on this saying of Camden, as 'going too far;' since Constantius was no otherwise a Christian than by that rule, 'He 'that is not against us, is on our side.' Heylin<sup>y</sup> in his 'Animadversions' on that book, though he rebuked Fuller, as being too tart upon so great a man as Camden, yet grants the thing, viz. that Constantius was not a thoroughpaced Christian.

What Camden spoke, he spoke only by the by. But some anti-pædobaptists do go about seriously to justify this, and make an argument of it for their tenet. And if only Danvers had done so, I should not have taken any notice of it: for he is used to such arguments. But Mr. Stennet also has not shewn the candour to throw away such a false prop to their cause: but reckons Constantine among those whose 'not submitting to this ordinance till they 'were adult, though born of Christian parents, shews, he says, 'that infant-baptism was not universally received.' Answer to Russen, p. 47. Of the rest that he there reckons up, I must speak in the following sections; but Constantine they ought of their own accord to have left out; for it does but hurt their cause to build on a supposal, which almost every one knows to be a mistake in matter of fact.

Yet something Mr. Danvers has to say for this too, that Constantius was a Christian. He takes out of the 'Magdeburgenses' a piece of a sentence of Eusebius, where speaking of Constantine, he, says he, was 'bonus a bono; pius a pio;' 'a good man, son of a good man; a pious man, son of a pious man.' It is not worth the while to look whether this be truly quoted or not<sup>z</sup>. It is certain that Eusebius, out of his desire to honour Constantine, and all that belonged to him, did stretch his expressions to further reaches than this: as where he says, Constantine 'became a follower of his 'father's piety [or pious favour, or respect] toward our religion<sup>a</sup>.' And at another place, 'He considered unto what God he should 'address, &c., and so he resolved to reverence his father's God 'only<sup>b</sup>.'

These places being picked out by themselves, would make one

<sup>x</sup> ['The Church History of Britain,' fol. Lond. 1655. Book i. p. 20.]

<sup>y</sup> [See 'Examen Historicum, or a discovery and examination of the mistakes, 'falsities, and defects in some modern 'histories.' (by P. Heylin) 8vo. London, 1659. part i. p. 20.—See likewise Fuller's reply to this remark of Heylin, in his 'Appeal of injured Innocence—in a con-

'troversy between Dr. P. Heylin and 'J. Fuller.' fol. 1659. part i. p. 71.]

<sup>z</sup> [The words occur in the Centur. Magdeburg. Cent. iv. cap. 3. sect. 'De 'tranquillitate Ecclesiæ sub Constantino,' tom. ii. p. 61. edit. Basil. 1560.]

<sup>a</sup> Hist. lib. viii. c. 13.

<sup>b</sup> De Vita Const. lib. i. c. 27.

think that Constantius had professed Christianity. But whoever reads the whole account will (whether he be prejudiced for one or the other side of this controversy) agree, that all that is meant by these compliments amounts but to this; that at the time when his fellow emperors did bitterly persecute the Christians, he on the other side favoured them, and screened them as much as he could, and on all occasions shewed a good opinion of them and their religion. And so it is in the places themselves explained; not that he ever made it his own religion. He died a heathen; and that he was by the heathens deified after his death, appears not only by the coins, but also by Eusebius' words.

And besides, Eusebius himself determines this matter clearly and fully (as far as concerns our purpose) in the place before recited<sup>c</sup>; when having related Constantine's baptism, he adds, 'That he was ' the first of all the emperors that ever were, that being regenerated,' &c. And again, 'That he only, of all that had been, did profess ' the Gospel of Jesus Christ with great liberty of speech<sup>d</sup>, i. e. did make open profession of it.

So little do some scraps of sentences picked here and there out of authors for one's purpose signify, to give an account of their true meaning.

Beside that, if Constantius had embraced the Christian religion when he was emperor; yet there is no appearance that he <sup>204.</sup> had any inclination to it when his son Constantine was <sup>(A.D. 304.)</sup> born, which was thirty years before. <sup>174.</sup> <sup>(A.D. 274.)</sup>

As for Helena, Constantine's mother, though the inquiry concerning her religion be not very material; because not many, especially great men, suffer their wives to choose what religion their sons shall be entered into; yet I made some inquiry. And after I had, in order to discover her religion, searched into the accounts of her condition and parentage, which are so variously given, (some making her a Bithynian, others a Briton, (but these last mar their own story by relating her to be a king's daughter; whereas all about that time speak of her as one of a mean quality, she being in scorn called *Stabularia*), some taking her for a wife, others for a concubine<sup>e</sup>, others for an absolute harlot<sup>f</sup> to Constantius, and those that call her a wife, must consequently grant that he had two at a time, or else that Helena was divorced when he married Theodora) I found it was needless to inquire any further, when I saw that Eusebius, a witness unquestionable in this matter, says<sup>g</sup>, that 'her

<sup>c</sup> De Vita Const. lib. iv. c. 62.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. cap. 75.

<sup>e</sup> Orosius, lib. vii. c. 25.

<sup>f</sup> Nicephorus, Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. c. 18.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. iii. de Vita Const. c. 47.

‘son Constantine first brought her to be a godly woman [or ‘Christian’], which she was not before.’ In her old age all agree that she proved a very zealous Christian. And it does something excuse her former way of living, that it was before her Christianity.

III. And as for Constantius the son of Constantine, what has been said of Constantine’s late baptism does without more ado satisfy us of the reason why his son Constantius was not baptized <sup>217.</sup> in infancy. Constantine probably was not resolved what (A.D. 317.) religion to be of, but certainly was not baptized when Constantius was born, nor a long time after.

And concerning Fausta, the mother of this Constantius, the daughter of Maximianus Herculius, (the bloodiest enemy the Christians ever had,) whom Constantine was forced to marry for reason of state; there is no probability that she was a Christian when this son was born, and very little that she was ever so at all; for Constantine put her to death not long after. On the contrary, some histories speak of her endeavours to alienate her husband’s mind from that religion<sup>h</sup>.

So Constantius not having been baptized into the Christian religion in infancy, (as it was impossible he should,) but coming afterward to the knowledge of it, and approving it, yet he did as his father had done before, i. e. he deferred his baptism to the end <sup>261.</sup> of his life; for it was but just before<sup>i</sup> his death that he (A.D. 361.) was baptized by Euzoius, the Arian bishop of Antioch.

About five or six years before, Lucifer, bishop of Calaris, had wrote his mind very plainly and bluntly to him in defence of Athanasius, whom he grievously persecuted; and told him, that instead of abusing Athanasius, he had<sup>k</sup> ‘great need to desire that ‘holy priest of God to pray to God for him for the forgiveness of ‘his impieties, as Job’s friends desired Job; and to procure himself ‘to be baptized by him, or some of his fellow bishops.’ And St. Hilary had complained<sup>l</sup> that he, *credendi formam ecclesiis nondum regeneratus imponeret*: ‘should pretend to prescribe a form of faith ‘to the churches, when he was not yet regenerated [i. e. baptized] ‘himself.’

Indeed both he and his father Constantine were guilty of such

<sup>h</sup> Mich. Glycas, Annal. lib. iv. [p. 248. edit. Paris, 1661.]

<sup>i</sup> Athanas. de Synodis,—§ 31. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. ult.

<sup>k</sup> Lucifer pro Athanasio, lib. i. [§ 46.

apud Biblioth. Patrum, tom. ii. edit. Colon. 1618.]

<sup>l</sup> Hilarius de Synodis, prope finem. [§ 78. p. 1184. edit. Benedict.]



wickedness, even after their declaring for the Christian religion,  
 154. Constantine in murdering so many of his kindred; and  
 (A.D. 254.) he in doing the like, and also in persecuting the catholic  
 Christians,) that it is no wonder if a guilty conscience kept them  
 from baptism, till they could find in their heart to repent of such  
 barbarities. And when the papists object to us our reformation  
 begun under such a king as Henry VIII, they may reflect, that  
 Constantine, by whose means the allowed profession of Christianity  
 itself was brought into the world, has not a much better character.  
 And that it does not please God always to choose good men, but  
 sometimes to make wicked kings instruments of bringing his  
 purposes to pass.

But yet there is, I think, no Christian writer that presses so hard  
 upon the credit of Constantine in this matter, as Baronius, and they  
 of the church of Rome that follow him. They strike in with that  
 scandalous story which the heathen writers of that time did dress  
 up on a purpose of spite and slander to the Christian religion,  
 and to Constantine for embracing of it: which was, that he, after  
 the murder of his son Crispus, and his wife Fausta, and his sister's  
 son Licinius, &c., was terrified in conscience, and sought among the  
 heathen priests for somebody that would expiate him, and give him  
 hopes of pardon. But that these told him, that they had rites of  
 expiation for very great sins, and for ordinary murders; but none  
 for such parricide as his was: and so left him in despair. And that  
 then it was that he was informed, what large offers of pardon the  
 Christian religion made to all comers that would be baptized; and  
 embraced that, not out of any liking to its doctrines, but because no  
 other would receive him.

It is questionless no discredit to any religion (but the excellency  
 of it) to have such sacraments, to which is annexed the promise of  
 forgiveness of the greatest sins; provided it does lay severe injunc-  
 tions against practising the same for the future. Yet since this  
 story is set on foot by Zosimus<sup>k</sup> and other heathens, out of spite to  
 Constantine and the Christian religion; and is false; and is shewed  
 to be so by Sozomen<sup>l</sup>, and other Christian historians, (for Constan-  
 tine favoured Christianity, and made laws in favour of it, before  
 this time,) it discovers an ill bias in Baronius, who (to make the  
 fable of his baptism at Rome more probable) embraces it. But the  
 men of that court make no scruple to advance the repute and pride  
 of it, by treading not only on the necks of present emperors, but

<sup>k</sup> Zosimi Histor. lib. ii. [cap. 29. p. 150.  
 edit. Reitemier, 8<sup>o</sup>. 1784. where consult

Heyne's note upon the passage, at p. 549.]  
<sup>l</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. i. cap. 5.

also on the credit of the most ancient ones. For, according to this character, what difference is there between Constantine and Julian; save that the one did actually go over to heathenism, and was willingly received by the pagan priests; the other would have done the same, but was not admitted by them.

Sect. 3. Of Gratian and Valentinian the Second.

There is no proof that their father, Valentinian the First, was a baptized Christian when they were born.

I. The import of some sayings of the authors which I shall have occasion to produce in the case of these two emperors, will not be so well understood by the ordinary reader, unless I first give a short history of their father and them, as far as concerns this matter.

Valentinian the First came from a mean original to the imperial dignity<sup>m</sup>. He gained his preferment by degrees in the army. He is not taken notice of by the historians, till such time as being an  
<sup>264.</sup> officer in the guards, when Julian came to the crown, he  
 (A.D. 364.) lost his place for his religion. For Julian being resolved to set up the old religion again, gave order that none should serve, (especially in those places nigh his person,) but such as would go to the heathen sacrifices, and partake of them.

There were a great many in the army, by this time, well instructed in the Christian religion, who rather than go to this sort  
<sup>264.</sup> of mass, would leave their places. Among the rest, this  
 (A.D. 364.) Valentinian and Valens his brother threw away their sword-belts<sup>n</sup>. Three years after, both these brothers came to be emperors. For Valentinian being chosen by the army, chose his brother his partner; and leaving him to govern the East, went himself to govern Rome and the western parts.

A reader that is not well acquainted with the custom, that persons converted in those times had, of delaying their baptism, would think by the zeal for Christianity that they shewed under Julian, that they both had been at that time baptized. But it is  
<sup>269.</sup> certain they were not both; for we find Valens baptized  
 (A.D. 369.) afterward. His baptism is mentioned by the historians, because of an unusual and wicked circumstance of it. He was by his wife, who was an Arian, persuaded to be baptized by Eudoxius the Arian bishop of Constantinople: and they together prevailed on him to swear at his baptism<sup>o</sup>, that he would always continue to be on the Arians' side, and expel the catholics out of the churches.

<sup>m</sup> Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. cap. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. lib. iii. cap. 13.

<sup>o</sup> Theodoret. Hist. lib. iv. cap. 12, 13.

An impious practice! Instead of baptizing into the Christian religion, as Christian, to baptize into a sect.

But Valentinian's baptism is not mentioned at all by the historians: neither should we be sure whether he was ever baptized, were it not for a passage in a letter of St. Ambrose, which I shall  
 217. have occasion to cite by and by. He was born in Pan-  
 (A. D. 317.) nonia, a country where Christianity had at that time but little footing; and probably of heathen parents. Who, or what they were, we hear no more than that his father's name had been Gratian, that he was nicknamed Funarius, and that he had been an officer in Britain, in the time of Constantine.

259. (A. D. 359.) II. Now as to his sons: Gratian was born to

267. (A. D. 367.) him before he was emperor, and on the fourth year of his reign was taken by him into partnership. But Valen-

266. (A. D. 366.) tinian, his younger son, was born to him the third year of his reign; so that he was nine years old when his

275. (A. D. 375.) father died. Ammianus Marcellinus says he was but four. But it must be a mistake, both because Socrates<sup>u</sup> names the consuls of the year in which he was born, which were Gratian

266. and Dagalaiphus, for the year of Christ 366; and also  
 (A. D. 366.) because the third year after, 369, this young Valentinian

269. (A. D. 369.) was consul himself, (according to the custom of those  
 275. (A. D. 375.) times,) which was before the year on which Ammianus makes him to be born.

278. When Valentinian the elder died, the army proclaimed  
 (A. D. 378.) this young Valentinian emperor, together with his brother. So they ruled the West, and their uncle Valens the East. And

279. when Valens died, Gratian quickly after chose Theodosius  
 (A. D. 379.) to govern the East.

282. Four years after, the usurper Maximus set up in Britain  
 (A. D. 382.) for emperor. And when Gratian marched against him,  
 283. (A. D. 383.) his army deserting, he was overcome by Maximus, and slain. Valentinian kept Italy and some other countries for a few years; during which time, being ruled by his mother Justina, a bitter Arian, he favoured the Arians, and persecuted the catholics, particularly St. Ambrose bishop of Milan.

Among other indignities, he summoned St. Ambrose to come and dispute before him, concerning the faith, with Auxentius the Arian; and he with his courtiers would judge between them. To which

\* Socrat. lib. iv. cap. 10.

<sup>u</sup> Lib. iv. cap. 9.



summons St. Ambrose answers in a <sup>x</sup>letter to him; which has this passage in it to our purpose:

‘ When did you hear, most gracious emperor, that laymen have  
‘ passed judgment on a bishop in a matter of faith? Do we then by  
‘ a sort of fawning so debase ourselves, as to forget what is the  
‘ privilege of the sacerdotal office? And that I should commit that  
‘ into the hands of another, which God has intrusted with me  
‘ myself? If a bishop must be taught by a layman, what will  
‘ follow? Then let a layman preach, and the bishop give attention;  
‘ let a bishop learn of a layman.

‘ This is unquestionable, that if we search either into the tenor of  
‘ the holy scriptures, or into the account of past times, there is none  
‘ can deny that, in matters of faith, *I say, in matters of faith*,  
‘ bishops are wont to judge of emperors that are Christians, and not  
‘ emperors of bishops.

‘ You will, by the grace of God, arrive to a better ripeness of age;  
‘ and then you yourself will pass an estimate, what sort of man for  
‘ a bishop he must be, that will put the sacerdotal right under the  
‘ judgment of laymen.

‘ Your father, a man, by God’s mercy, of a more advanced age,  
‘ said, “It does not belong to me to judge between bishops.” Does  
‘ your grace now say, “It does belong to me to judge?” And he,  
‘ though at that time baptized in Christ, yet thought himself unable  
‘ to bear the weight of so great a judgment. Does your grace, for  
‘ whom *the sacrament of baptism is yet reserved to be obtained by you*,  
‘ take upon you the determination of matters of faith, when as yet  
‘ you are not partaker of the sacrament of faith?

This scuffle between the court on one side standing for the Arians, and the major part of the people on the other for their religion, their church and their bishop, increased so far, (the emperor demanding the church for the Arians, the people continuing day and night in it; the court giving out that bishop Ambrose meant to set up for an usurper<sup>y</sup>, St. Ambrose declaring, that as he abhorred the thoughts of resistance<sup>z</sup>, or of stirring up the people, so he could not, on the other side, run away from his church and flock in that danger of their souls, but was ready to suffer death quietly,) that Maximus the usurper, who had already, since the defeat and death of Gratian, settled himself in Britain and France, and gaped for an opportunity of invading Italy, took his advantage of these discon-

<sup>x</sup> Ambrosii Epist. 32. [ep. 21. edit. Benedict. tom. ii. p. 860.]

<sup>y</sup> Ambrosii Epist. 33. [ep. 20. edit. Be-

nedit.]

<sup>z</sup> Idem, Oratione in Auxentium. [Op. tom. ii. p. 863. edit. Benedict.]

tents; and he published a DECLARATION in behalf of the true religion, and threatening war to Valentinian<sup>a</sup>, if he did not forbear to persecute the catholics.

The court, for all their anger against St. Ambrose, yet could not find a fitter man to avert this storm than he, because of the influence which they thought he might have upon Maximus. They sent him therefore on an embassy of peace. Which he performed with all that fidelity that became a good Christian, who would shew himself loyal to his prince, that had despitefully used him and his religion.

But as to his errand, he could do no good (for usurpers, when they find their advantage, do not use to be kept back by reasons of conscience). On the contrary, when Maximus saw that St. Ambrose would not communicate with him, nor with the bishops that communicated with him, he commanded him to be gone. And St. Ambrose sent an account of his embassy to Valentinian<sup>b</sup>, advising him to look to his safety, *adversus hominem pacis involucro bellum tegentem*, ‘against a man, that under pretence of peace, [or doing good offices,] covered his design of war [or invasion].’

And so it proved: Maximus invaded Italy; and Valentinian had nothing to do but to fly.

But Theodosius, who had, ever since he heard of the death of Gratian, resolved to revenge it, having now his army ready, came from the East; and though the usurper had strengthened himself by humouring all parties of Christians, Jews, and Pagans; yet he  
 288. overcame him, slew him, and resettled Valentinian, and  
 (A. D. 388.) brought him off from his fondness to the Arians, (his foolish mother being now dead,) and reconciled him to St. Ambrose, whom he ever after honoured as a father.

This quietness had lasted but three years, when a new usurper Eu-  
 291. genius started up; with whom Argobastes, one of the great-  
 (A. D. 391.) est men at court, traitorously joined. Valentinian, being then  
 292. in France, was seized by Argobastes, and after a while  
 (A. D. 392.) murdered by him. This was in the year 392; so that he was when he died twenty-six years old.

III. He had, a little before this treason broke out, resolved to be baptized before he went for Italy. He had a particular desire to receive it from the hands of St. Ambrose, and had lately sent to Milan to him, to desire him to come and give it him. St. Ambrose was on his way to France when he heard the fatal news, which rendered his journey now too late.

<sup>a</sup> Theodoret. Hist. lib. v. cap. 14.

<sup>b</sup> Ambros. Epist. 27. [24, in edit. Benedict.]

One shall hardly read a more compassionate lamentation than St. Ambrose makes on this account in his funeral sermon for Valentinian. What with the object that was present, and what with the occasion it gave to remember Gratian, he says all that could be said by a man that had lost his own children by a like fate. He persuades himself, that if he could have arrived before the murderous blow was given, he might have prevailed with the tyrants to spare his life at least. I doubt he was mistaken in that; for who ever read of an *Oliver* that did that?

But as to Valentinian's dying unbaptized; he comforts his sisters, that were present at the sermon, by assuring them, that in such a case God accepts of a sincere faith joined with a hearty desire of baptism, as if the person had been actually baptized. Which saying of his is often cited for the resolution of like cases. 'I hear,' says he, 'you are troubled that he did not receive the holy rites of baptism. Tell me, what is there in our power but the will and desire?' And he, both a good while ago had a purpose of being baptized before he returned into Italy; and also lately expressed his desire of being baptized by me: and it was for that reason especially that he would have me sent for.

'Hath he not then that grace which he desired, and which he endeavoured to have? Inasmuch as he desired it, he has received it.'

Upon the news of this rebellion and murder, Theodosius came once more from the East, and obtained a victory over Eugenius, which, (counting the numbers that sided with Eugenius,) the historians count almost miraculous, and slew him. As for <sup>294.</sup> the traitor Argobastes, he saved the hangman a labour. (A.D. 394.)

And this was one of the last good acts of that noble emperor. <sup>295.</sup> He died quickly after. And St. Ambrose had the sorrow (A.D. 395.) of preaching his funeral sermon too.

I cannot but observe from that sermon, the different grounds on which St. Ambrose, from those on which Baronius does condemn Maximus. Baronius' way is, when any great man in history comes to an ill end, or other calamity, to find something in his life which may be supposed to be the cause for which that judgment fell on him: and it is commonly something done against the church of Rome. And speaking of the ill end of Maximus, when he looks backward for the cause of it, he takes no notice of his rebellion and usurpation, and murder of his prince; like the man, who, pretending to tell the faults of a horse that he sold, forgot to mention that he was blind; and observes how once on a time, a great while be-

fore, being appealed to by some bishops, he had meddled in ecclesiastical matters more than became him<sup>c</sup>.

But St. Ambrose, in the foresaid sermon<sup>d</sup>, having spoken of Gratian and Theodosius as being then in heaven, adds, *Contra autem Maximus et Eugenius in inferno, docentes exemplo miserabili quam durum sit arma suis principibus irrogare.* ‘But Maximus and Eugenius are now in hell, teaching by their dreadful example how heinous a thing it is for men to bear arms against their sovereigns.’

IV. From this whole relation it appears,

1. That Valentinian the younger was never baptized.

2. That Gratian probably was baptized some time of his life or other. Because St. Ambrose, in Valentinian’s funeral sermon, makes frequent comparisons between the two brothers, and often mentions Valentinian’s want of baptism; but observes no such thing of Gratian. Besides, he calls him there *Fidelis*; which is a term never given by the ancients but to a baptized person.

But yet it is probable his baptism was not in infancy. For what should make Valentinian the father baptize his eldest son in infancy, and not his youngest? Unless we may judge that Justina, the mother of the youngest, being an Arian, (for the mother of the eldest was not so,) and the father himself being a catholic, they could not agree into which faith he should be baptized. For the Arians were like the Donatists for that; that they had so ill an opinion of baptism given by the catholics, that they baptized such over again; as may be seen by St. Ambrose’s Discourse against Auxentius<sup>e</sup>. And therefore,

V. 3. The chief question is, whether Valentinian the father were baptized himself at the time when his youngest son was born. We have heard already<sup>f</sup>, that he was a baptized Christian at a certain time, when he said, that ‘he did not think himself fit to judge between bishops.’ But what time of his reign this refers to we have no way to know certainly. The passage that looks most like it in all that we read, is that which happened at the election of St. Ambrose himself to the bishopric of Milan: and St. Ambrose was more likely to know that, and to refer to that, than any other.  
274.  
(A. D. 374.) For then, as Theodoret tells us<sup>g</sup>, the bishop of Milan being dead, the people were much divided about the choice of a new one, some setting up one, and some another: so that to avoid confusion, Valentinian ordered the neighbouring bishops that were

<sup>c</sup> Ad annum 385.

<sup>d</sup> Orat. in funere Theodosii, [§ 39. Op. tom. ii. p. 1209. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>e</sup> Orat. in Auxentium, in fine. [§ 37. Op. tom. ii. p. 874. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>f</sup> § 2 of this chapter. <sup>g</sup> Hist. lib. iv. cap. 6.



then in that city to choose one for them. The bishops desired that he himself would pitch upon some person. But he answered, ‘ This ‘ is a thing too great for me to undertake. You that are filled with ‘ the grace of God, and illuminated by the light thereof, may much ‘ better do this office of choosing a man for a bishop.’

If this were the time St. Ambrose means, at which he was then a baptized person; this was but a year, or thereabouts, before his death: for St. Ambrose was made bishop in the year of <sup>274.</sup> Christ 374, as Baronius, or the beginning of 375, as <sup>(A.D. 374.)</sup> <sup>275.</sup> Petavius computes; and Valentinian died November the 17th, 375.

So that he might for all that be unbaptized when his son Valentinian was born, which was, as we said<sup>h</sup>, nine years <sup>266.</sup> before, viz. anno. Dom. 366. <sup>(A.D. 366.)</sup>

#### Sect. 4. Of Theodosius the First.

His father was not a baptized Christian when he was born.

I. Theodosius, (of whom we had occasion to speak in the last <sup>279.</sup> section,) who was chosen by Gratian to be his fellow <sup>(A.D. 379.)</sup> emperor, is another of the instances of persons not baptized in infancy. What I have to say of him may be despatched in a few words. He was baptized quickly after he was chosen emperor<sup>i</sup>, and in a fit of sickness, by Acholius, (or, as the Greeks write his name, Ascholius,) bishop of Thessalonica: being then thirty-four years old, as Victor counts; forty-four as Socrates reckons; or about fifty, if the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* be to be relied on.

II. His father, who was also named Theodosius, had been put to <sup>270.</sup> death by order of Valens nine years before. At what <sup>(A.D. 370.)</sup> time of his life he was baptized, I think we should not have known but for Orosius, who (because he was a Spaniard, his countryman) speaks more particularly of his concerns. So that we know by him that he was baptized before he died: but not till twenty-five years (by the lowest account) after this his son was born. And whether he was, at that time of his son’s birth, a Christian in intention, or an unbeliever, is not to be known.

Orosius’ account is this<sup>k</sup>; that he, being a commander in the army, had done good and faithful services: but yet that on a sudden, and for what reason nobody knew, there came an order that he must be put to death. Which when he understood, ‘ he desired to ‘ be baptized first, for the forgiveness of his sins. And when he ‘ was made partaker of that sacrament of Christ, as he desired;

<sup>h</sup> § 2.

<sup>i</sup> Socrates, lib. v. cap. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Hist lib. vii. [cap. 33.]

‘ being, after a laudable life in this world, secure also of an eternal ‘ life, he willingly offered his neck to the executioner.’

Other authors, though not mentioning his baptism, give the same account of his death. And the occasion of it they relate to be such, as gives us an idea of the mischief that superstitious jealousies do, when they get into the head of a cowardly prince. Valens had had some attempts made to dethrone him. And there was a report ran up and down, that some that used curious arts had found that he should quickly have a successor: and the first letters of his name should be THEOD. The names of Theodorus, Theodoret, Theodosius, Theodulus, &c., were then very common names. And this fancy cost a great many of them their lives; and this captain among the rest. His son Theodosius was not, it seems, at that time a man noted enough to come into danger. When he came to the throne, he managed his affairs so well both in peace and war, that none that went before, or that came after, did ever excel him.

The reason why he was not baptized in infancy must have been, because his father was not then baptized, and perhaps not a believer. I know that Socrates (at the forecited place, lib. v. cap. 6.) says, that he (the said emperor) had Christian parents, [or ancestors,] *ἀνωθεν ἐκ προγόνων χριστιανὸς ὑπάρχων*. But this was a phrase commonly used in the case of those whose parents became Christians at any time before their death, though they were not so at the time of the birth of those their children: as I shall, out of many instances that might be given, have occasion to give some presently.

#### Sect. 5. Of St. Basil.

There is no proof to the contrary, but that he was baptized in infancy.

I. I did in the tenth chapter of the First Part of this work produce the evidences that are in antiquity, that St. Basil was baptized in infancy. But it is necessary to consider those also that are brought to the contrary.

I know of but one man of the antipædobaptists that does pretend him for an instance of one baptized in his adult age, though born of Christian parents: and he does it very unfairly. He found in <sup>260.</sup> Osiander's<sup>1</sup> epitome of the Magdeburgenses, that Vincen-  
(A. D. 360.) tius in his *Speculum* tells a story of St. Basil's going to Jerusalem, and being baptized in Jordan by Maximus, the bishop there. But though Osiander and the Magdeburgenses<sup>m</sup> too do, when they mention this, declare that this is a story of no credit;

<sup>1</sup> Cent. 4. lib. iii. cap. 42.

<sup>m</sup> Cent. 4. cap. 10. [tom. ii. p. 941. edit. Basil. 1560.]

<sup>1144.</sup> and that Vincentius' collection, being of late years, is of (A.D. 1244) no repute; and that there is no historian of credit or antiquity that speaks of any such thing: yet Mr. Danvers<sup>n</sup> sets down the quotation in such manner and words, as if they had recited it as a credible history: whereas they do both of them, at the places cited, declare that it seems to them that he was baptized in infancy by his father, (of which I also have, in the chapter fore-mentioned, given some confirmation,) or by some other minister.

He quotes also at the same place, and for the same thing, Socrates, lib. iv. cap. 26, and Sozomen, lib. vi. cap. 34, who neither there, nor any where else, have any word tending that way.

II. As Vincentius made his collections of historical matters without any judgment, taking them out of any sort of books, genuine or spurious; so the author, out of whom he<sup>n</sup> owns to have this, is Amphilochius' life of St. Basil. And that is known by all to be a *Grub-street* paper, a gross forgery; and is sufficiently detected to be such by Rivet<sup>p</sup>, Baronius<sup>q</sup>, Bellarmin<sup>r</sup>, Possevin, and before them all, by bishop Jewels<sup>s</sup>.

The author thereof had, I suppose, read or heard that Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, had wrote an account of St. Basil's life, (as he did indeed, and Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory Nyssen did the like; but that which was written by him is lost, as are most or all his other works). He therefore put forth his stuff under the name of that great man. But it betrays itself by many tokens, of fabulous miracles, incongruities in history, &c. And in that fable which he gives of his baptism, there are such silly monkish quibbles and witticisms put into the discourse that passed between Basil and Maximus, who is made to be his baptizer, (as one asks, *Quis est mundus?* the other answers, *Qui fecit mundum*, &c.?) that one might guess from what shop they come.

F. Combefis has published this piece in Greek and Latin, and endeavoured to vindicate it by saying, the main part of it might be genuine though it be interpolated and mixt with some fabulous additions: but, as Mr. Du Pin observest, he brings no kind of proof of his opinion.

III. The true account wrote by Nazianzen, Orat. 30. *in laudem Basilii*, nor that by Nyssen, have no mention of any such thing;

<sup>n</sup> Treatise of Baptism, part i. cap. 7. [p. 60.]

<sup>o</sup> Vincentii Speculum Histor. lib. xiv. cap. 78.

<sup>p</sup> Crit. Sacr. lib. iii. cap. 27.

<sup>q</sup> Ad annum 363.

<sup>r</sup> De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, [§ De Amphilochio, apud Op. tom. vii. p. 68. edit. Colon. 1617.]

<sup>s</sup> Apolog. Eccles. Angl. Artic. i. Div. 33.

<sup>t</sup> Nouv. Biblioth. tom. ii. Amphiloch.

nor that under the name of Ephraem Syrus. On the contrary, Nazianzen seems plainly to refer to his baptism in infancy by his own father; as I shewed before.

Their reciting all the remarkable passages of his life, after he came to age, without mentioning any thing of his baptism, is a strong argument that there was no such thing: since in all that are baptized at age, their baptism makes a considerable circumstance for a writer, whose chief subject is their Christianity. And therefore the monk, who framed a life for him that might sell well, would not omit it: and to dress it up the better, made it to be in Jordan, where Christ was baptized, and Constantine desired to be.

IV. If the twenty-ninth chapter of St. Basil's book, *de Spiritu Sancto*, be genuine, (which is questioned by Erasmus and others,) then it is certain that the same man that baptized him did also put him into the ministry: for so he says in that chapter. He is there shewing, that the custom used by him and the churches, of saying the Doxology, thus, 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Spirit;' or thus, 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit,' (instead whereof the Arians would have him say, By the Son in the Holy Spirit,) was no innovation. He quotes several ancient authors that had spoke so: and begins thus:

'I myself, if it be proper to say any thing of myself in this case, do keep the use of this expression *ὡσπέρ τινα κληρον πατρῶν*, as an inheritance left me by my father, having received it from a man who lived a long time in the ministry of God, by whom I was both baptized and also put into the ministry of the church.'

This could not be Meletius, (whom Dr. Cave reckons to be the man by whom he was ordained deacon,) because he afterwards reckons Meletius as another of his authors for the same usage; and says, 'that the famous Meletius is of the same sentiment, they that have conversed with him do affirm.'

That St. Basil himself did use to baptize children, I shewed before in the First Part of this work, ch. xii. § 9, 10.

#### § VI. Of St. Gregory Nazianzen.

He was not baptized in infancy. An inquiry whether his father was a Christian, when this his son was born.

I. When fourteen instances are produced to prove any thing, and one can shew that thirteen of them are mistakes, he is apt to suspect that there is some mistake in the other too, though he cannot find it out. Yet here is an instance of a Christian's son not baptized in infancy, if this Gregory's *Carmen de vita sua* be a



genuine piece, (as I never heard of any that questioned it,) and if there be no mistake in the reading of it.

I shall represent impartially, and as briefly as I can, the proofs that are brought of his being born before his father's Christianity; and those to the contrary.

That he was not baptized in infancy is plain, both from the fore-said poem *de vita sua*, and also from the sermon that he made at his father's funeral, and also from the history of his life by Gregorius Presbyter. For in all these a full relation is given, how he, in a voyage by sea from Alexandria to Athens, was in great danger of shipwreck by a storm; 'and whereas all the rest in the ship were 'terrified with the fear of their bodily death, I,' says he, 'did more 'dreadfully fear the death of my soul. For I was in great hazard 'of departing this life unbaptized: amidst the sea waters that were 'to be my death, wanting that spiritual water. And therefore I 'cried out, entreated, besought, that some space of life might be 'granted to me.' He goes on to shew how his lamentation and dread on that account were so great and so moving, that the people in the ship forgot their own danger, in compassion to those terrors which they saw were upon his soul. And how he then vowed to God, that if he were delivered from that danger, he would offer himself up to God; and did so accordingly.

II. That his father was not a Christian when he married, nor for some time after, is plain from the said funeral oration<sup>x</sup>. He was of the religion called *Hypsistarian*. These men, as is there related, did so renounce the worship of idols and sacrifices, as that they retained nevertheless the worship of fire and torches.

Mr. Le Clerc<sup>y</sup>, being busied in finding contradictions in the Fathers, thinks he has found one here: because Gregory in another place<sup>z</sup> says, his father *ὑπ' εἰδώλοις πάρος ἦεν ζῶων* which he translates, 'was subject to the idols of animals:' not minding that *ζῶων* there is the participle of the poetical verb *ζῶω* and not the genitive of *ζῶον* though Bilius had noted that criticism.

He continued in that superstition till the year of the council of 225. Nice, anno Dom. 325. His wife had before used her (A. D. 325.) persuasions and prayers for his conversion. But then, when Leontius bishop of Cæsarea, and some other bishops, were going by that place for Nice to the council, she got them to instruct him in the grounds of the Christian religion: and he was baptized

<sup>u</sup> Orat. 19. [Orat. 18. edit. Benedict. fol. 1778.]

<sup>x</sup> Orat. 19. [or 18.]

<sup>y</sup> Life of Greg. Naz. Bibliothèque, tom. x.

<sup>z</sup> Carm. 1. de Rebus Suis. [Op. tom. ii. p. 31. edit. Paris. 1630.]

into it quickly after: and not long after that took priest's orders: and when the bishop of Nazianzum died, became his successor. In which office he lived forty-five years, and died near 100 years old. All this is clear in the oration aforesaid.

III. Now the question is, whether our Gregory his son were born before that his father's conversion in the said year 325, or after?

And the solution of it must be collected by knowing, if one could, how old he [the son] was when he died. For we know justly the year on which he died, by St. Hierome, who wrote the tract *de Scriptoribus Ecclesiast.*<sup>a</sup> the fourteenth year of Theodosius, anno 392;

289. and says there<sup>b</sup>, that Gregory Nazianzen had been dead (A.D. 389.) but three years. He died therefore in the year 389.

The difficulty is, to know what age he was of when he died.

Gregorius Presbyter, who wrote his life, says, he died very old. And Suidas (who mistakes the time of his death two years, making him to live till the thirteenth year of Theodosius) says, that he was then ninety years old<sup>c</sup>. By that account he must have been born in the year 300, which is twenty-five years before his father was a Christian.

But Baronius<sup>d</sup> finds reason, as he thinks, to correct this chronology, from a passage out of Gregory himself; who, in the aforesaid *Carmen de vita sua*, speaking of his studying at Athens, and of his resolution to leave that place, says, it was then his thirtieth year [or, the thirtieth year]. This Baronius concludes to be the year 354, by Julian the apostate's being a student there at the same time, (for he was made Cæsar and sent into France the next year.) From whence he infers, that Gregory was born in the year 324, (which was the year before his father's conversion,) and that he was but sixty-five years old when he died.

IV. But Papebrochius in his *Acta Sanctorum Maii octavo*<sup>e</sup> corrects this correction, and sets the time of his birth back to the old account: bringing a great many probable evidences that Gregory's age must be greater than sixty-five years; since he himself so often speaks of his being unfit for business, by reason of his great age.

When Maximus the cynic opposed his being made bishop of Constantinople; Gregory, in his oration on that subject<sup>f</sup>, brings in his adversaries, objecting to him his sickliness and old age.

When he desired to resign the said bishopric, (which was eight

<sup>a</sup> [Hieronymus de Viris illustribus. Op. tom. ii. edit. Vallars.] Verb. Hieronymus. [cap. 135.]

<sup>b</sup> Verb. Gregor. [cap. 117.]

<sup>c</sup> Verb. Γρηγορ.

<sup>d</sup> Ad an. 354. et 389.

<sup>e</sup> Chronologia vitæ Sancti Greg. expensa et emendata. [apud Acta Sanctorum Maii, tom. ii. p. 370.]

<sup>f</sup> Orat. 28. [or 26. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>281.</sup> years before he died,) and persuaded the bishops then  
(A.D. 381.) present at the council to consent to his so doing; he used this argument: ‘Let these my grey hairs prevail with you:’ which looks as if he were then more than fifty-seven years old.

This learned man does also answer the reason that Baronius brings to the contrary, by endeavouring to shew that the foresaid mention of the thirtieth year is not meant for the thirtieth year of his life, (of which it was the fifty-fourth, as he thinks,) but the thirtieth of his studies. And indeed the words, as they stand, do bear that sense very well; they are these:

καὶ γὰρ πόλυσ τέτριπτο τοῖς λόγοις χρόνος·  
ἤδη τριακοστὸν μοὶ σχεδὸν τοῦτ’ ἦν ἔτος.

‘For I had already spent a long time in study of learning:

‘This was almost the thirtieth year [or, my thirtieth year.]’

Gregorius Presbyter, who wrote the life of St. Gregory, and took it for the most part out of his foresaid poem, seems to understand it so: and yet his words are capable of the other construction too. He expresses it thus: *τριακοστὸν ἤδη πληρώσας ἔτος ἐν τοῖς μαθήμασιν*. ‘Having now completed thirty years [or else his thirtieth year] in ‘the study of learning<sup>h</sup>.’

Moreover Rufinus, who was contemporary with him, says<sup>i</sup>, he died *jam fessa ætate*, ‘being spent with age.’ Which hardly can be said of one that was but sixty-five years old.

These reasons, joined with some others of less weight, prevailed with Papebrochius to embrace the old account as the truest, viz. that he was ninety years old when he died; and consequently that he was born anno Dom. 300. And that was twenty-five years before his father was a Christian.

Mr. Le Clerc, who writes a sort of life of this saint<sup>k</sup>, manages this argument of his age after a heedless and absurd manner. For first, he, following Pagi, who had followed Papebrochius, says, that he was born anno 300, which is twenty-five years before his father’s conversion: and accordingly supposes with the foresaid authors, that the year on which he left Athens was the fifty-fourth of his age. And the use he makes of this is, to ‘wonder that he would spend so ‘great a part of his life in studying rhetoric, forgetting in the mean ‘time all care of his aged parents and of the church of God.’ And

g Orat. 32. [or. 42. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>h</sup> In vita Gregorii, [Operibus ejus præfixa, p. cxxxii. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>i</sup> Hist. lib. ii. cap. 9. [See the two books

added by Rufinus to the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.]

<sup>k</sup> Bibliothèque, tom. x.

yet afterward, in the same life, he ‘wonders why, since it was the ‘opinion of that age, that those that die unbaptized are damned, ‘his father and mother being such zealous Christians did not get ‘him baptized in infancy.’ Which is to suppose that he was born after his father’s conversion, which he and every body place at the year 325; or else it is the wonder of a man that dotes. One of these suppositions helps a man that would expose Gregory to censure; which seems to be the design of this writer of lives for this and some other Fathers. And the other serves to raise objections against the universality of the then practice of pædo-baptism. But it is very unfair to serve both these intentions from this instance; because one of them supposes him to be born after his father was a Christian, and the other twenty-five years before.

There is another reason to make one believe that he was born before his father’s conversion; which is this. In the foresaid oration at his father’s funeral, he tells how his mother, being desirous of a son, and begged one of God in her prayers, and that in answer to those prayers he was born to her. And afterward he comes to speak of those prayers that she made for her husband’s conversion: in which prayers she was encouraged to the greater hope of being heard, ‘as having,’ says he, ‘already made trial of ‘the Divine liberality.’ On which Bilius makes this comment; ‘namely, when she obtained her son Gregory of God, by her ‘prayers, as he had said a little before<sup>1</sup>.’ And indeed that is the only instance mentioned before in that oration, to which one can suppose him to refer.

Also this reason: he often mentions his mother’s pious and Christian care and dedication of him to God in his infancy, and from the womb<sup>m</sup>, but never any such thing of his father.

V. These reasons would be sufficient to sway a man to believe that he was born before his father was a Christian; were it not for one that seems very plain to the contrary. And that is a passage in the foresaid poem, where Gregory the elder earnestly persuades his son, who had more mind to a private life, to become his assistant in the office of bishop of Nazianzum. He uses all the force of paternal authority, requiring him, upon pain of the loss of his blessing, to comply with his desire, and to relieve his old age: and, among the rest, has these words<sup>n</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> Annot. in loc.

<sup>m</sup> Orat. Apologet. [Orat. ii. edit. Benedict.] et alibi.

<sup>n</sup> Carmen de vita sua, vers. 520. circiter pag. 6. edit. Paris. 1610. [p. 9. edit. Paris. 1630.]



Οὕπω τοσούτον ἐκμεμέτρηκας βίον,  
 Ὅσος διήλθε θυσιῶν ἐμοὶ χρόνος·  
 Δὸς τὴν χάριν, δός.

So many years of life you have not seen  
 As I, your father, have in orders been.  
 Do me the kindness, do.—

Papebrochius does take notice of this place, and says, it has puzzled every body that has read it. He goes about to answer it by supposing the word *θυσιῶν* is misprinted, and that it should be *ἐτησίων*. But he produces no manuscript in favour of his amendment: and if one were to amend by the sense without any book, I should think rather that *θυσιῶν* has crept in by mistake for *πολιῶν* (or, for the verse sake, *τῶν πολιῶν*: for he often here lets an anapæstus go for the fourth foot of his iambic). The sense according to of editions is, ‘Your life is not of so many years, as are the years of my sacrificing;’ i. e. officiating in the priest’s office: which is a sense very difficult to reconcile in history with truth. That of Papebrochius; ‘You are not so old as I am;’ is true; but a poor sense. ‘You are not so old as my grey hairs are,’ is to the purpose of the father’s argument at that place.

Bishop Hall had found out this place<sup>o</sup> when he sought for instances of clergymen that had made use of the marriage-bed after they were in holy orders (of which this is the plainest that he can find). And the antipædobaptists have taken it from him; and made use of it for their purpose.

VI. If this pass for current, then we must say that Baronius’ account of his age is the truest; and further, that he was yet two or three years younger than he makes him. For if he had been full thirty years old at the year 354, he would still have been born a little before his father’s baptism, and two years before his ordination. But the words are *σχεδὸν τριακοστὸν*, ‘almost the thirtieth;’ which in a poem may indeed pass, though he were but twenty-seven or twenty-eight.

We must say likewise, that all that he himself, and Rufinus, and Gregorius Presbyter, do speak of his old age, must be understood of a *præmatura senectus*, caused by his sickliness, which he often mentions. And that Suidas, when he makes him live to ninety years old, mistakes at least twenty-seven years: which might pos-

<sup>o</sup> Honour of the married Clergy, [maintained against the malicious challenges of C. E. Masse-priest,] lib. ii. § 8. [8vo.

Lond. 1620. reprinted in his Works, fol. 1624. p. 709, &c.

sibly be, since he wrote 600 years after Gregory was dead: and  
 880. that what he himself says of his mother's experience of  
 (A.D. 980.) the Divine liberality, before her husband's conversion, must refer to something else. And that Gregorius Presbyter, (who  
 840. also lived near 600 years after St. Gregory,) if his mean-  
 (A.D. 940.) ing be to speak of the time when he left Athens and went home, as the thirtieth year of his studies, must be mistaken by taking what Gregory himself had said of the thirtieth year, for the thirtieth of his studies, (as others have since done,) which, according to this supposition, must be but almost the thirtieth (viz. the twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth) of his life. And that Mr. Du Pin (who has gone a middle way, making him to be born anno 318<sup>p</sup>, which falls seven years before his father's baptism,) does yet place his birth eight or nine years too soon. For if he was born after his father's priesthood, it must be anno 327 or 326 at soonest. And possibly the numerical figure in the text of Mr. Du Pin is mistaken by the printer: for in the index at the end of the tome, it is printed 328. And according to this account, he was but sixty-one or sixty-two when he died. And his father and mother (for they were much of one age) were about fifty, when he [the son] was born. Which is old for a woman to have children: and yet she had one, if not more children, after her son Gregory.

And then also we must say, that this Gregory the elder was as singular in this practice of keeping his children unbaptized; as Mr. Johnson<sup>q</sup> has shewed him to be in the point of passive obedience: and as the papists will say he was in getting children after his being in holy orders.

I hope the reader will pardon the length of this disquisition, and the uncertain issue of it at last: for he will perceive by it how difficult it is to find the birth or age, even of such whose later years have been never so well noted. I lighted on one thread more, which I thought might have directed in this labyrinth. I observed that St. Gregory once speaks of St. Basil, as having been about the same age with himself. For he says at the end of the funeral oration<sup>r</sup>, which he makes for him, 'This elogium is given thee, O Basil! by  
 ' a tongue that was wont to be most acceptable to thee, καὶ ὁμοτίμου  
 ' καὶ ἡλικος, and by one of the same function, and of the same age  
 ' with thee.' If then I could find St. Basil's age, it would, I thought, direct me in that of his friend Gregory; at least so near, that we should not mistake thirty years. But I cannot find readily

<sup>p</sup> Nouvelle Biblioth. tom. ii. <sup>q</sup> Julian the Apostate. [chap. ix. 8vo. Lond. 1682.]

<sup>r</sup> Orat. 20. [Or. 43. edit. Benedict.]

the account of St. Basil's age any more than of the other, and am quite out of the humour of entering on a new search after any body's age. St. Basil died 379, (the first day of that year.) This was ten or eleven years before Gregory died. (A. D. 379.)  
 279.  
 289.  
 (A. D. 389.) St. Basil, as well as St. Gregory, is often spoken of as an old man; and yet by this last account he must be but fifty-one, or thereabouts, when he died.

But then, on the other side, that same oration on St. Basil (in which Gregory mixes so many of his own concerns, that it is a sort of history of both their lives) does by many circumstances, too little and too long to be repeated, shew that they were but young men when they left Athens. He says, that when they declared their purpose of returning home from thence: not only all their intimates 'and equals of the same age with them, ἡλικες,' but also many of the doctors there, expressed a great regret at their leaving the university so soon, being very unwilling to part with them. Which makes it probable that they themselves were but young masters of arts; and so confirms Baronius' opinion, that they were but thirty, or almost thirty, and not fifty-four, as they must have been by the other account.

Besides, St. Gregory in that oration recounting the great examples of Christian fortitude that had been in Basil's family, and speaking of the great persecution that was in Pontus under Maximinus, relates how great a share the grandfathers of Basil had in it. Whereas if St. Basil himself had then been about ten years old, (as he must have been by 'the first account,) his father, (A. D. 310.) rather than his grandfathers, would have been likely to be mentioned. I said in the former editions, that that one plain place aforesaid, which makes this Gregory born after his father's baptism and ordination, did seem to oversway all the reasons of chronologers to the contrary. But I have since minded another absurdity that attends it. St. Hierome *de Scriptoribus Eccl.* speaks of Gregory as having been his master: 'Præceptor meus, quo scripturas explanante, didici.' Now St. Hierome himself was born in the year 329, and it is not likely that he would speak so of one that was but four years older than himself. Perhaps it may be more likely that a word may be misprinted, than so many absurdities allowed. I shall determine nothing, but leave it to others.

VII. The antipædobaptists have taken notice of no other children of that Gregory the elder, but this his son Gregory. But he had two other children, a daughter Gorgonia, and a son Cæsarius. There is no account whether Gorgonia were elder or younger than



her brother Gregory; save that Elias Cretensis (if he knew any better than we) makes her to be younger<sup>s</sup>. If she were elder, she must have been born before her father was a Christian; since it is the hardest matter that may be to bring her brother Gregory's years within that compass. However that were, she was not baptized in infancy; and being afterward left to her own discretion, she did not receive baptism till a little before she died<sup>t</sup>, when she was so old as to have grandchildren, whom she had instructed in the Christian faith. Her husband also, whom she had married (as it seems by her brother's words at her funeral) while he was a heathen, was by her prevailed on to be baptized with her. She died before her father, who died before St. Basil. And since St. Basil died, as was said, on New Year's Day 379, it seems to have been 375 at the soonest, when she died. Her brother Gregory was then, by the last account of his age, but forty-eight. It is very unlikely then that she was younger, having then grandchildren of such an age.

Cæsarius was younger than either of them, and died the first of them. And though Gregory's words at his funeral<sup>u</sup>, concerning his baptism, are not very plain for the time of it: yet they seem to intimate that he had then lately received it. And indeed (to observe this here once for all) the far greatest part of those that were not baptized in infancy, but were left to take their own time for it, we find to have put it off from time to time till they were apprehensive of death, excepting such as went into orders, or the like. But we find no baptized person, except this Gregory, that did so leave his children unbaptized.

If all the children of this elder Gregory were born after their father's Christianity, and yet left unbaptized; it is the instance but of one man's practice. And there is some more excuse for a bishop, or other minister to do this, than for other men; because if his children fall sick, or into any sudden danger of death, he is ready at hand in the house to give them baptism.

It was probably from some compliance with this practice of his father, that St. Gregory, in one of the places that I quoted<sup>s</sup>, gives that opinion, which is singular in him; that 'it is a good way if a child appear not to be in any danger of death, to defer his baptism for some time.' He mentions *three years* or thereabouts. And as he, at the same place, advises and counts it necessary, 'if it be in

<sup>s</sup> Comm. in Greg. Naz. Orat. 19. [apud Greg. Op. tom. ii. p. 761. edit. Paris. 1630.]

<sup>t</sup> Naz. Orat. in Laudem Gorgoniæ, [Orat. 8. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>u</sup> Orat. in Laudem Cæsarii, [Orat. 7. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>x</sup> Part i. ch. 11. § 7.



‘danger of death, to baptize it immediately:’ so it is probable the same was his father’s opinion; and that this his son had no sickness in his infancy, and so he thought he might defer the baptizing him.

That many people in this time delayed and put off the baptizing of their children something longer than ordinary, not out of principle that so they ought to do, but out of negligence, and a procrastination which they themselves owned to be blamable; appears

<sup>312.</sup> plainly by that common and proverbial speech, which (A. D. 412.) Isidore (speaking of Zipporah’s circumcising her child) mentions; and says, ‘was used to be said in time of danger: “God’s judgments come upon us; let us baptize our children out of hand.”’

#### Sect. 7. Of Nectarius.

There is no appearance of his parents being Christians, nor knowing who they were.

I. Though St. Gregory Nazianzen, who, after his father’s death, was bishop of Constantinople, had done more for the restoring the catholic faith there, than had been done by any man in so short a time; yet he found a necessity of resigning the place. Partly by reason of his age and infirmity; and partly for that there was such a contention in the council of bishops about him. Some said it was not canonical, that he, having once accepted another bishopric formerly, should remove from it. Others, that he living as a hermit, wholly given to study and prayers, was not at all dexterous in making his court with the emperor for the good of the church: neither had he any good mien, but a contemptible presence.

To allay these heats, he did what St. Clement<sup>z</sup> had advised in such a case to be done. He willingly abdicated, and said, ‘If this contention be upon my account, I am ready to depart; only let the ‘flock of Christ be in peace.’

And when they were in consultation about another to be chosen; whom should they light on but one Nectarius, a layman of Tarsus, of a senator’s rank, remarkable for a grave and comely presence, but of no learning or skill in divinity! The emperor liked this man so well, that he was finally chosen. They did the gentleman a great diskindness; for of a creditable and graceful alderman, they made of him a very insipid bishop.

But what is to our purpose is this; Nectarius, though he was by

<sup>y</sup> Isidor. Pelusiot. lib. i. Ep. 125.

<sup>z</sup> Clemens Romanus, Epist. i. ad Corinth. cap. 54.

<sup>a</sup> Naz. Orat. ad 150 Episcopos. [Or. 43. edit. Benedict.]

belief and profession a Christian, yet had not been as yet baptized<sup>b</sup>. They were forced, having baptized him, to give him ordination a few days after, notwithstanding the apostolical canon against choosing a novice for a bishop.

II. The antipædobaptists would make an argument from hence, that his parents must have been of their persuasion, since they had not baptized him in infancy. But first they ought to shew that his parents were Christians: since, as I said before, half the world at this time were such as had been, since they came to age, converted from heathenism, and liked Christianity; but the greater part of them did put off their baptism from time to time for a long while. And one might name several beside this man, that were pitched on by the people for bishops before they were baptized; some, whose parents are known to be heathens; and some, whose parents are not at all mentioned in history; so that it is impossible to know what religion they were of. But they do not make instances for this purpose, unless they are proved, at least by probable arguments, to have been born of Christians.

As for Nectarius' parents, we know nothing of their religion. And I believe it is as hard to find who they were, as it is to know who was Homer's or Job's father.

#### Sect. 8. Of St. John Chrysostom.

His parents were probably heathens at the time of his birth.

I. Among all the ancient Fathers, there is none that has had so many to write his life as St. Chrysostom. For, besides that Palladius, who lived together with him, has wrote his Dialogue purposely on that subject; the ancient historians, who lived nigh his time, Socrates<sup>c</sup>, Sozomen<sup>d</sup>, Theodoret<sup>e</sup>, &c., have given a larger account of him than of any other man. And in the middle ages, there are abundance that have wrote tracts of the same: but these latter have intermixed several fables, which are disproved by the elder.

Of these Palladius says<sup>f</sup>, that he was baptized by Meletius, bishop of Antioch, after he had been instructed by him three years in the Christian religion. And though none of the other ancient writers do mention this his baptism at man's age; yet it is very  
<sup>520.</sup> probable, since, as far as we can learn, his parents were  
 (A. D. 620.) heathens at the time of his birth. Georgius, patriarch of

<sup>b</sup> Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. [cap. 8.]  
 Sozomen. lib. vii. [cap. 8.]

<sup>c</sup> Lib. vi. [cap. 2, &c.]

<sup>d</sup> Lib. viii. [cap. 2, &c.]

<sup>e</sup> Lib. v. [cap. 27, &c.]

<sup>f</sup> Dial. de vita Chrysostomi, [apud Chrysost. Op. tom. xiii. edit. Montf.]

800. Alexandria, and Metaphrastes, do say they were; and (A.D. 900.) they are not in this contradicted by those elder.

II. His father Secundus died presently after he was born; as he himself intimates, lib. i. *de Sacerdotio*. His mother Anthusa was a <sup>274.</sup> Christian when this her son was twenty years old: but (A.D. 374.) <sup>254.</sup> that is no argument that she or her husband were so at (A.D. 354.) the time of his birth. At that time the heathens turned Christians as fast as the papists in England turned protestants in the time of the reformation. And even at that time, when her son was twenty years old, though she was then a Christian in belief, yet the aforesaid historians, Georgius and Metaphrastes, say, that she was not baptized till her son was baptized first. They say it of his parents in the foresaid life, that they were baptized by Meletius after their son. But it could be true only of his mother, his father being dead long before.

I believe the antipædobaptists would not have conceived that they had ground enough to make Chrysostom one of their instances, if they had not been encouraged thereto by Grotius. And what he says is, that ‘he being born of Christian parents, as the truer opinion is, and educated by Meletius, yet was not baptized till the ‘twenty-first year of his age<sup>h</sup>.’

That he was born of Christian parents he brings no proof at all. And it is little to the purpose that he was educated by Meletius. As bishops do not use to take infants to nurse, (though lads or young men to educate they may,) so in this case it appears that Chrysostom was twenty, or at least eighteen years old, before he came to Meletius. And then Meletius did with him as any bishop now would do with a young man that had been brought up in heathenism: he instructed him, and when he had continued a catechumen three years, baptized him.

That he was so old as I say, before he came to Meletius, is plain; because by all the accounts he came not to him till he forsook the school of Libanius, the heathen master of rhetoric. And that he continued his hearer till that age, appears by what he himself writes, *Oratione I. ad viduam juniorem*; where speaking in praise of those women that continue widows, and how they are valued even among heathens, he tells this story; ‘For I formerly, when I was young, ‘took notice that my master, who was one of the most superstitious ‘men that ever lived, did much admire my mother. For as he ‘asked some that were about him who I was, and one made answer

‘ that I was a widow-woman’s son; he asked me, how old my mother was, and how long she had been a widow. And when I told him that she was forty years old, and that it was twenty years since she buried my father; he was much affected at it, and speaking aloud to those that were present, “Strange,” says he, “what brave women there are among the Christians!”’

Some chronologers find it more agreeable with the computation of time to suppose that it was not full twenty, but eighteen; which by a round number he here calls twenty. But it is much one to this purpose.

The saying of Libanius seems to suppose that Anthusa had been a Christian now for a considerable time, or at least that he took it so. But as he knew nothing of her concerns till that moment; her professing of Christianity at that time was enough to make him say what he did, without making any inquiry how long she had been of that profession.

Some readers also will be apt to conclude, that Chrysostom had been at that time but a little while a hearer of Libanius, (from whence it would follow probably that Anthusa was a Christian when she first sent her son to this school,) because Libanius did not at this time know who he was. But the nature of those auditories or lectures was, that one from one part of the city, and another from another, came on the weekly lecture days to hear, and sent their contributions: so that a lad or a man might be a hearer for a long time before the master had any personal knowledge of him. The word [school] being otherwise used in our time, might be apt to make this mistake. But it is to be taken in the ancient sense, as in Acts xix. 9. The school of Tyrannus was not a college of lads under his care, but a place of public lectures that he kept.

III. There is, on the contrary, reason to think that she was not a Christian when she consented that her son should hear this master, who was a spiteful enemy to the Christian religion. And as this is probable of itself, so it is made more than probable, that not only she, but her son himself also, was a heathen when he came first to hear him, by what Sozomen affirms, viz. that ‘ On a time when Libanius was like to die, some of his friends asked him who he thought fit should be his successor? And he answered, “John” (meaning this John, who came afterward to be called Chrysostom) “should have been the man, if the Christians had not stole him away from us<sup>1</sup>.”’ The word is *εὑλόησαν*, ‘robbed us of him:’ which argues that he was a heathen before.

<sup>1</sup> Hist. lib. viii. c. 2.



IV. Mr. Du Pin, in the notes he gives upon what he had said of Chrysostom<sup>k</sup>, says, that ‘some writers make his parents to be ‘heathens; but that he himself, in the first sermon against the Ἀνόμοιοι, says that “he was bred up and nourished in the church;” and that it appears out of his first book *de Sacerdotio*, c. i. that his mother was a Christian when his father died, which was ‘quickly after she was delivered of him.’

Having a great regard to every thing that this excellent author says, I read over on purpose both those tracts. And in the sermon found nothing that seemed to relate any thing at all to this matter; so that I believe there must be some mistake. Also in the first chapter of the book cited, there is nothing at all of the matter. That which I guess the most probable to be meant, is chap. ii, where Chrysostom’s mother, earnestly entreating him not to leave her, recounts to him the great troubles she had undergone about his estate and education in her widowhood; and yet that she had kept herself a widow, and had gone through the brunt of all these fatigues; ‘In ‘the first place,’ says she, ‘being assisted by the help [or influence] ‘that is from above, ὑπὸ τῆς ἁνωθεν βοηθουμένη ῥοπῆς and then also ‘the comfort which I had by the continual sight and company of ‘you, my son, did not a little contribute to it.’

But here is nothing but what might be properly said by a Christian woman in reference to those times in which she had been a heathen: since God almighty employs his providence in relieving the necessities not only of Christians, but of all men and other creatures that know him not. She does not mention in all that long speech any praying to God, or use of his word, that she had made in those days; which to me is a greater proof that she was not at that time a Christian, than the foresaid words are that she was.

At least here is nothing that can nigh countervail the argument from the foresaid words of Libanius concerning this John’s heathen profession at first, rehearsed by Sozomen. And Sozomen is a good witness in this case, having lived part of his time together with  
<sup>340.</sup> Chrysostom. For he had wrote several books before that  
<sup>(A.D. 440.)</sup> history; and he had completed that history in 440. So  
<sup>307.</sup>  
<sup>(A.D. 407.)</sup> that he must have been born before St. Chrysostom died, which was anno 407.

#### Sect. 9. Of St. Ambrose.

There is no account of his parents being Christians at the time of his birth.

I. St. Ambrose’s case is just the same with that of Nectarius.

<sup>k</sup> Nouvelle Biblioth. tom. iii. in Chrysost.

And he himself, after he had heard how Neectarius was chosen bishop of Constantinople, said, 'I was utterly unwilling to be ordained; and, when there was no remedy, desired that at least my ordination might be delayed for a longer time. But the rule of the church could not prevail; the force of the people prevailed. Yet the western bishops have approved of my ordination by their consent; and the eastern by their doing the same thing<sup>1</sup>.' The rule or prescription that he speaks of is that mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Tim. iii. 6, which canon, it seems, the people would by force have to be dispensed with, when they had an extraordinary opinion of a man.

He was a layman, and was governor under Valentinian the emperor, of some provinces of Gallia Cisalpina: and when the people of Milan (which was one of the cities under his government) were, after the death of Auxentius their bishop, in a tumult about choosing another, he came to keep the peace, and persuaded them to quietness and concord. He spoke to them so handsomely and so gravely, that all parties agreed on a sudden to pitch upon him for bishop<sup>m</sup>. He opposed it what he could: but they sent to the

<sup>274.</sup> emperor for his consent, because he was at that time the (A.D. 374.) emperor's minister. And he said, 'He was very glad that the men he chose for governors were so well liked by the people, that they would choose the same for bishops.' So he gave his consent, but yet he would not determine the choice, as being a thing out of his sphere. He ordered the bishops then present in or about the city to direct the choice of the people, who continued resolute for Ambrose. But Ambrose was not as yet baptized. He received baptism at the hands of Simplicianus<sup>n</sup>, and within eight days was ordained bishop.

II. Our business being to inquire why he was not baptized in infancy; the antipædobaptists would have it that he was born of Christian parents: and some of them stick not to say, that Paulinus in his life says he was. But Paulinus does not say so. What he says of his father is this, that he was a nobleman of Rome, and governor of Gallia. But he was the less likely to be a Christian for that: the senate and great men of Rome being the last

<sup>233.</sup> (A.D. 333.) body of men in the empire that came over to the Christian

<sup>291.</sup> (A.D. 391.) faith. Insomuch that a long time after this, when St. Ambrose was an old man, Valentinian the second had much ado to

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 82. ad Vercellens. Eccles. [Ep. 63. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>m</sup> Paulinus in vita [Ambrosii. apud Op. tom. ii. Append. edit. Benedict.] Rufinus,

Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 11. Socr. lib. iv. c. 30. Sozomen. [lib. vi. c. 24.] Theodore. lib. iv. c. 6.

<sup>n</sup> Augustin. Confess. lib. viii. c. 2.

withstand the attempt made by the senate to bring again into fashion the heathen worship. So says St. Ambrose at his funeral, ‘ Before his death he refused to grant the privileges of the temples, when such men stood up for them, of whom he might well be afraid. Whole crowds of heathen men came about him; the senate petitioned. He was not afraid for the sake of Christ to incur the displeasure of men<sup>o</sup>.’ And if one may guess by circumstances, he lost the empire and his life in this quarrel; Eugenius the usurper, that prevailed against him, having all the heathen party on his side: who restored those heathen altars which Valentinian had denied, and set up temples of Jupiter<sup>p</sup>. And Argobastes had threatened, if he overcame Theodosius, to make the great church at Milan (the St. Paul’s of that city) ‘ a stable for his horses<sup>q</sup>;’ because they would not communicate with Eugenius, nor receive his offering, as being an usurper. But better news came to town quickly, as I shewed before in the history of Valentinian<sup>r</sup>.

I bring in this to shew, that when Paulinus makes St. Ambrose’s father to have been a great man at Rome; that is no argument that he was a Christian. But indeed Paulinus, or whoever wrote that life, (for Erasmus<sup>s</sup> takes it to be a forgery of some late monk, as I observed before,) knew so little of his father’s concerns, that he did not know his name. He makes his name to be Ambrosius, because the son’s was so: but his name, if his son knew better<sup>t</sup>, was Symmachus. Though the life-writers copying one out of another, do to this day call him Ambrosius. He seems to have died while St. Ambrose was young.

But at the time when St. Ambrose was come to man’s estate, Paulinus does indeed say that his mother was a widow, and dwelt at Rome, and was then a Christian: if that would avail any thing to prove that her husband or she were so formerly, when he was born.

III. On the contrary, a strong proof that they were not, is that which he says of himself, that he was not brought up in the bosom of the church. For in his second book *De Penitentia*, cap. 8, speaking of his own unworthiness, and unfitness to be a bishop, he says it will be said of him, ‘ Ecce ille, non in ecclesiæ nutritus sinu,’ &c. ‘ Lo! this man that was not brought up in the bosom of the church,’ &c.

As for what St. Ambrose’s own thoughts were of the necessity of

<sup>o</sup> Orat. in obitum Valentiniani. [Op. tom. ii. p. 1173, &c. ed. Benedict.]

<sup>p</sup> Paulinus in vita Ambrosii. [Op. tom. ii. Append. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>q</sup> August. de Civitate Dei, lib. v. c. 26.

<sup>r</sup> Sect. iii. § 3.

<sup>s</sup> Censura prefixa operibus Ambrosii.

<sup>t</sup> Ambros. Orat. in obitum Satyri, [Op. tom. ii. p. 1113, &c.]



infant-baptism, it appears by his words cited before<sup>u</sup>, that he made it a great question, 'whether a child could be saved without it.'

Sect. 10. Of St. Hierome.

There is no proof to the contrary, but that he was baptized in infancy.

I. St. Hierome, who wrote the lives of several persons of note that had been before him, found none of the ancients that came after him so kind as to write his: for that life which was formerly published with his works is a mere fable. Yet he having wrote a great many occasional letters, which, for the goodness of the style, and the learning contained in them, are preserved; many of the chief passages of his life may be picked out of them.

In all that he has said of himself, or the anonymous author of the life aforesaid, or any body else has said of him; there is no ground to question his baptism in infancy, except an obscure passage, mentioned twice in the same words, and those ambiguous ones, in two letters that he wrote to pope Damasus.

The occasion was this: St. Hierome being retired from Rome into  
260. Syria, in order to lead a monk's life there, found the  
(A.D. 360.) people of those parts much divided; not so much in opinions of religion, as in disputing which of several that were set up was the lawful bishop of Antioch, with whom they ought to hold communion. Some acknowledged Meletius; others refusing him, followed Paulinus; and others adhered to Vitalis.

And another difficulty was; they thereabouts expressed their faith in the Trinity by acknowledging three hypostases. Being asked by the Latins what they meant by *hypostases*; they answered, *Personas subsistentes*, 'persons subsisting.' St. Hierome and the other Latins answered, that they had the same faith, and owned 'three persons subsisting.' This was not enough; they would have them express the word itself, *three hypostases*. St. Hierome scrupled the doing that, because *hypostasis* among secular authors had signified *substance* or *essence*: and 'who,' says he, 'will with a 'sacrilegious mouth preach up three substances?' And again, 'If 'any one by *hypostasis*, meaning *οὐσία*, *essence*, [or being,] does 'not confess that there is but one *hypostasis* in three *persons*; he is 'estranged from Christ.'

About these things he writes to Damasus, who had in the mean  
272. time been made bishop of Rome<sup>x</sup>, desiring to know  
(A.D. 372.) whether he and the church of Rome (for he is resolved to go by their example) do allow of this word *hypostasis* for person.

<sup>u</sup> Part i. ch. 13. § 2.

<sup>x</sup> Epist. 57. [15. in edit. Vallarsii.]



And also which of the foresaid parties, viz. of Meletius, Paulinus, or Vitalis, they would communicate with: for he would do the same. ‘And this I do,’ says he, ‘inde nunc meæ animæ postulans cibum, unde olim Christi vestimenta suscepi. “Desiring now food [or instruction] for my soul, from that place where I formerly took upon me the garments of Christ.”’

This letter not procuring, as it seems, an answer so soon as he expected, he writes another, Epist. 58, [16 ed. Bened.] to the same purpose; desiring him with greater importunity to give him his answer. In which he uses the same motive: but expressed in words so just the same, that one gives no light to the other. ‘Ego igitur, ut ante jam scripsi, Christi vestem in Romana urbe suscipiens,’ &c. ‘I therefore, who, as I wrote before, took on me the garment of Christ in the city of Rome,’ &c.

From this place Erasmus<sup>y</sup> raised a conjecture that he was baptized at Rome. And if so, he could not be baptized in <sup>1412.</sup> infancy: for he was born at Stridon in Dalmatia; and did not come to Rome till he was big enough to go to the grammar school.

And what Erasmus spoke doubtfully, other following writers of this Father’s life, Baronius, Du Pin, Dr. Cave, &c. have (as it happens in relating matters) told as an absolute unquestioned thing<sup>z</sup>.

That which Erasmus says is this; ‘He means his baptism by that taking on him Christ’s garments: for, I think, he does not mean it of his receiving priest’s orders; but in baptism there was a white garment given them.’

He might have been sure enough that he did not mean it of the habit of a priest; for St. Hierome was not as yet ordained priest, <sup>278</sup> when the letter was writ: and when he was ordained, it <sup>(A.D. 378.)</sup> was not at Rome, but at Antioch by Paulinus, to whose communion Damasus had it seems advised him.

II. But there was another sort of habit or garment, which he had then already put on, and which he knew to be very much valued by Damasus, whose acquaintance he now sought, and which he probably took upon him at Rome, (for he took it on him in his younger years<sup>a</sup>, and it was at Rome that he spent those,) and that was the habit of a monk, which he then wore when he wrote that letter. And it is a great deal more likely that he means that, than the albes which were worn but a few days. Especially since neither he,

<sup>y</sup> In vita Hieronymi.

<sup>z</sup> [See likewise the same asserted and defended by his last editor Vallarsius, in

the life prefixed to vol. xi. of his works, chap. 3. p. 17-19.]

<sup>a</sup> See § 5.

nor, I think, any other author, among all that variety of expressions which they use for denoting baptism, do ever use that phrase of *receiving the garments of Christ*. Because the ordinary Christians did not use, for constant wearing, any particular garment as a badge of their religion. But the monks and virgins that had professed perpetual virginity, did at that time (as has been usual ever since) wear a peculiar habit, as a token of their profession.

Of which if any one doubt, it must be one that has never read any thing in St. Hierome: for he, being given to an overweening opinion of that way, mentions it with great eulogiums on every turn. And as he calls the persons, *servos Christi*, and *Christo sacros*, ‘servants of Christ,’ and ‘consecrated to Christ:’ and the virgins, *virgines Dei*, ‘God’s virgins,’ (as if married people did not belong to God or Christ at all :) so, what is most to our purpose, he commonly calls that peculiar sort of coat that the virgins or nuns wore, *Christi tunicam*, ‘the coat or garment of Christ.’ And the veil, *flammeum Christi*, ‘the veil of Christ.’ Of each of which I will give one instance.

In his *epitaphium*, or funeral oration, in praise of Paullab, he recounts how desirous she had been in her lifetime that her children, and those that belonged to her, should take on them that habit and profession of renouncing the world, and leading a single life, as she had done that of a widow, and how she had in great measure her desire: for besides that Eustochium her daughter was then a professed virgin, her granddaughter also, by her only son Toxotius, being then a child, was, by her parents *Christi flammeo reservata*, ‘designed to wear the veil of Christ.’

And in his letter to Eustochiumc, the subject whereof is, *de virginitate servanda*, to exhort her to continue constant and unstained in her purpose of perpetual virginity, he says, ‘It is not fitting, when ‘one has taken hold of the plough, to look back; nor being in the ‘field, to return home;’ ‘*nec post Christi tunicam ad tollendum* ‘*aliud vestimentum tecto descendere:*’ ‘nor after one has put on the ‘coat of Christ, to come down from the roof to take any other ‘garment.’

Since these expressions are the very same with those that he used before of himself; it is probable that those also are to be understood of the monk’s habit: or at least, it is not at all necessary that they must be understood of his baptism at Rome. And if they be not, then there remains no kind of ground to doubt of his being baptized at Stridon in infancy, as other Christian children were. For neither

b Epist. 27. [108. ed. Vallars.]

c Epist. 22. [22.]

Erasmus, nor any of those that have followed him, have brought any other proof but these words; and had it not been for them, no man had ever had such a surmise.

III. Baronius does indeed say, that ‘after he was baptized, he ‘presently reformed his life, which before he had led in some lewdness: and whereas he had lost the first virginity, he kept undefiled ‘that which he calls the second, which is after baptism<sup>d</sup>.’

If this were true, or could be proved, the question were at an end. But there seems to be no more ground for it than that Baronius, having first taken for granted from Erasmus’ conjecture that he was baptized at man’s age, thought it more decent to lay that fornication, of which he is known to be guilty, rather before his baptism than after.

The tract of St. Hierome to which he refers for the proof of this, is his ‘Apology made for his books that he had wrote against ‘Jovinian.’ In which there is indeed mention of those ‘two sorts ‘of virginity,’ and there is also a confession of his own loss of virginity. But it is in several clauses or paragraphs that he mentions these two things; and not so as to affirm, or intimate that he could claim, either of the said sorts of virginity himself. I think not; yet it may be proper to lay before the reader the places themselves.

He had been accused by a great many, that in the said books against Jovinian he had so excessively commended virginity, that he had in some expressions represented all marriage as sinful; for which accusation he had indeed given too much occasion. Yet he vindicates and explains the places excepted against as well as he can. And then says,

‘This therefore I protest, and make it my last declaration, that ‘I did not then condemn marriage, nor do now condemn it. Virginity I do extol to the sky; not that I am possessed of it, but ‘that I the more admire a thing that I myself have not. It is an ‘ingenuous and modest confession to commend highly that in ‘others which one has not one’s self. Must not I, because being of ‘a gross body I am fain to go on the ground, admire that faculty ‘that the birds have of flying in the air; and envy the pigeon, ‘which

‘Radit iter liquidum, celeres neque commovet alas.’

‘With stretched out wings glides through the yielding sky?’

‘Let no man deceive himself: nor let him undo himself by

<sup>d</sup> Ad ann. 372.

‘hearkening to a soothing flatterer. The first virginity is that which is from one’s birth: the second is that which is from one’s second birth. It is none of my saying, it is an old rule: *No man can serve two masters, the flesh and the spirit. The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh. These are contrary one to the other, that we cannot do the things we would.* When any thing in my book seems severe, regard not my words, but the scripture from which the words are taken. Christ is a virgin. The mother of our virgin Lord is a virgin,’ &c.

Here, after he had confessed and apologized for himself, he passes to the other theme of commending virginity, and shewing the inconveniences of an incumbered and secular state. Here is nothing affirmed that he himself had either of the two sorts of virginity. And if any one judge, as Baronius seems to have done, that the chain of thought leads one to think he meant so; that conjecture will be much overbalanced by what he says plainly and expressly of his own case in another place<sup>e</sup>, where he speaks of his ill life, and aggravates the guilt of it as being the defiling of his baptism. For commenting on that expression of Isaiah concerning himself, that he was *a man of unclean lips*, he says, ‘He as being a just man had sinned only in word, and therefore had only unclean lips, not a foul conscience. But I, as using my eyes to lust, and being offended by my hand, and sinning by my foot, and all my limbs, have every thing unclean. And because having been once baptized with the Spirit, I have defiled my garments again; I deserve the second baptism, which is that of fire.’

It was some great and mortal sin that he speaks of, (for they do not use to speak so of sins of daily incursion,) and we read of no such that he was guilty of, but his fornication. His words also are such as to particularize that.

And besides, he professes in a great many places<sup>f</sup>, (in the fore-said letter to Damasus for one,) that he undertook the monk’s life, as a state of voluntary penance for his sins; whereas they that in those times were baptized in their adult age, would have been counted greatly to undervalue the grace of baptism, if they had thought any such thing necessary for the sins they had committed before. They always speak of baptism as giving a person a free, total, and absolute discharge from all guilt of sin, original or actual, before that time.

IV. One thing that will stick as an objection in the minds of

<sup>e</sup> Explanatio Visionis Isaiae, Epist. 142. [Ep. 18. sect. 11. ed. Vallars.]

<sup>f</sup> Epist. 61, 58, &c. [16.]



those that are acquainted with the ecclesiastical discipline of that age, is this; that if he had been baptized in infancy, or any time before his fornication; that sin being after his baptism would have rendered him incapable of holy orders. Because the canons of

225. (A. D. 325.) that time, those of Nice<sup>g</sup>, those of Eliberis<sup>h</sup>, and

205. (A. D. 305.) those of Neocæsarea<sup>i</sup>, as also *Can. Apostol.* 61.

214. (A. D. 314.) (*als.* 53.) do enact, that if any one after his baptism did fall into fornication, or any other of the great crimes; such a man, though he might by penance be restored to lay-communion, must never be ordained to the holy functions. And so strict it was, that if such an one were ordained by mistake, his crimes not being known; when they came afterward to be known, he was to be deposed by the Nicene canon: but the Neocæsarean admits him to continue in the name, and some part of the office; but not to offer, as they called it, i. e. to consecrate the holy elements. And this they will have to be observed, 'because (as the words of the Nicene canon are) the holy church does in all things keep to that which is 'blameless,' or, without scandal. But as for heathens, or men unbaptized, they judged that no sin whatever committed in that state was to be an impediment of their promotion after they came to be baptized. In a word, they reckoned that penance, or a long course of repentance, would cure a mortal sin, but so as to leave a scar. But that baptism did perfectly wash off all the stain and discredit of sins committed before it. So that St. Hierome's being ordained presbyter (as we said before he was) by Paulinus, will make an argument that his baptism was after his fornication.

But then they that know that the canons ran thus, know also that the practice was not always so strict and regular as the canon: but that, on the contrary, these and some other such strict rules were frequently dispensed with in the case of such men as came afterward to be of great merit or abilities, which the church could not well want: and that St. Hierome was, without controversy, the most learned and best skilled in interpreting the scripture of any man then living; and also was a great favourite of pope Damasus, whose interest was great in all the church.

And besides, an observation which retorts the force of this argument strongly to the other side, is this; that these canons had in great measure their force upon St. Hierome. For he not only protested, when he was made presbyter, as he tells us himself<sup>k</sup>, that if

<sup>g</sup> Can. 9, 10.    <sup>h</sup> Can. 30.    <sup>i</sup> Can. 9, 10.

<sup>k</sup> Epist. 61. contra errores Joannis

Hierosol. [This epistle, or treatise, is removed from its place by Vallarsius, and

Paulinus who ordained him, ‘meant thereby to take him out of his ‘state of monachism, [or penance,] that he would not so accept it;’ but also, after he was ordained, refused, out of a deep humility and sense of his sin, to execute the priestly office, at least in the principal parts thereof. Of which there are these proofs :

1. That in all his letters and works one finds no mention or instance of his acting in that office. Of this I am no further confident, than that having taken notice as I read, I remember none.

2. That Epiphanius affirms this of him, and of Vincentius, another monk that had been ordained. The occasion was this. Epiphanius had, in a case which he judged to be of necessity, ordained Paulinianus, St. Hierome’s younger brother, priest; though the place in which he did it was out of his own diocese. Being blamed for this encroachment by John bishop of Jerusalem, he makes this apology<sup>l</sup>; ‘Though no man ought to go beyond his own measure; yet Christian charity, in which there is no guile, is to be preferred before ‘all. Nor should you consider what is done; but at what time, and ‘in what manner, and for what reasons, and upon whom, the thing ‘was done. For when I saw that there was a great number of holy ‘brethren in the monastery; and the holy presbyters Hierome and ‘Vincent, by reason of their modesty and humility would not execute the offices proper for their title, nor labour in that part of the ‘ministry, in which consists the chief salvation of Christians,’ &c.

His being made priest after his sin, is not so great a proof of his baptism coming between, as those severe censures of himself are, that his sin was after his baptism. He that in that age should have spoken of his sins committed before baptism, as he does of his<sup>m</sup>, ‘I ‘came into the fields and wilderness, that there bewailing *dure-scentia*<sup>n</sup> *peccata*, my sins that lie so hard upon me, I might move ‘the pity of Christ towards me,’ would have been censured to derogate from that article of the creed, ‘I believe one baptism for the ‘remission of sins.’ And he himself says in other places<sup>o</sup>, ‘all ‘fornications and lewdnesses of the most scandalous nature, impiety ‘against God, parricide or incest, &c., are washed away in this ‘Christian fountain or laver.’

In how different a strain does St. Austin confess his sins, which, though much greater than St. Hierome’s, viz. a continued course of fornication with several harlots, yet because his baptism came after

printed with others of similar argument in tom. ii.—See the passage quoted, Op. ii. p. 452. sect. 41.

<sup>l</sup> Epist. ad Joann. Hierosol. 60. [Ep. 51. ed. Vallars.]

<sup>m</sup> Epist. 61. [see above.]

<sup>n</sup> [Vallarsius reads *adolescencia*.]

<sup>o</sup> Epist. ad Oceanum de unius uxoris viro. [Ep. 69.]

them, he says thus of them<sup>p</sup>; ‘What praise ought I to give to the Lord that my memory recounts these things, and yet my soul is in no terror for them?’

V. I said he entered into a monk’s life young (when I was shewing that it was probable he took the habit at Rome). He himself says so in several places<sup>q</sup>.

The vulgar reader is not to imagine that this monastic life was then of the same sort with that, which is now for the most part in use in the church of Rome. On the contrary, the first institution and primitive practice of it was commendable. It is time, and the corruption of the age, and superstitions added to it, and the great revenues that have been settled on the monasteries, that have perverted it. They professed virginity; and they did accordingly with wonderful hardships of diet, lodging, &c., keep under the body. They sold all they had, and gave it to the poor. They renounced all the affairs of secular life, but at the same time used daily labour for their living: they had not then the fat of the land; nor one politic head, whose interest they were to promote. If any one endeavoured to live at ease, or indulge himself, he was not counted a monk. St. Hierome speaks of some few that he had seen of this sort<sup>r</sup>. ‘I have seen,’ says he, ‘some that after they have renounced the world, *vestimentis duntaxat*, in their garments, or habit only, and by a verbal profession, not in deeds; have altered nothing of their former way of living: they are richer, rather than poorer, than before: they have as much attendance of servants,’ &c. So that we see all monks, good or bad, wore the garments of a monk.

Yet as commendable as it was in the practice then; St. Hierome has been under some censure, for his excessive urging it on people; not only in his own time, but ever since; and not only among protestants, but among those of the church of Rome that are any thing impartial. Mr. Du Pin, who is highly to be valued for that quality, says of him, ‘concerning virginity and the monk’s life, he often speaks so, as if he would have one think they are necessary for salvation<sup>s</sup>.’

Where shall one meet, even among the late monks, an expression in praise of this sort of life more exorbitant than one that he has in his letter to Eustochium, a lady that professed that state? Where addressing himself to Paulla her mother, he says, ‘Your daughter has procured you a great benefit: you are now become God’s mother-in-law,’ *socrus Dei esse capisti*. This is something worse than

<sup>p</sup> Confess. lib. iii. cap. 7.

<sup>r</sup> Epist. 4. ad Rusticum. [Ep. 125.]

<sup>q</sup> Epist. 2. [52.] item. 62. [82], &c.

<sup>s</sup> Nouv. Bibl. tom. iii. p. 1.



calling the habit, *the garments of Christ*. He means, that the daughter, by professing a religious virginity, was become the spouse of Christ; and so the mother must be his mother-in-law. But such allegories, carried too far, border upon impiety. They are not to be so easily pardoned to a man of a cool head: but St. Hierome having had the spleen to a high degree, must be allowed some favour in the censure of his expressions. Those men when they are in, at commending or disparaging any thing, are carried to speak more than they mean at their sedate times.

VI. But it was not during the times of Damasus, that St. Hierome fell under any censure for this his over-lashing: but afterward, in the times of Siricius. Damasus had been so much of the same temper, that it is likely he approved of him the better for it; and

285.  
(A. D. 385.) that one reason of his using those high-flown expressions was, to ingratiate himself with him. And we find him, in his writings, during this later popedom, frequently appealing to the times of Damasus. 'I wrote,' says he, 'while Damasus of blessed memory lived, a book against Helvidius, of the perpetual virginity of the blessed Mary: in which I had occasion, for the setting forth the advantage of virginity, to say many things of the inconveniences of marriage. Did that excellent man, and learned in the scriptures, that virgin doctor of the church which is a virgin, find any fault with that discourse? And in my book to Eustochium, I said some things harder yet concerning marriage; and yet nobody was offended at it. For Damasus, being a lover of chastity, heard my commendations of virginity with a greedy ear.'

This last is the book which he complains is now *lapidatus*, "stoned;" or generally condemned.

He says also in another place<sup>u</sup>, 'that Damasus did himself write in commendation of virginity, both in prose and verse.'

It is the less wonder, that in letters between these two, that did so magnify this state of life, the habit, or garment, by which the continent life of a monk was professed, should be called *the garment of Christ*.

And if what I have produced be sufficient to make this probable, then I have cleared St. Hierome's parents of an imputation that has been laid on them ever since Erasmus' time, even by learned men: and which St. Hierome himself would have counted a heinous one. For when he declares 'how sinful it would be, if any parents that are Christians should suffer their children to die unbaptized;' (as

<sup>t</sup> Apolog. pro libro contra Jovinianum. [Epist. 50. (Vallars. 48.) sect. 17.]

<sup>u</sup> Epist. 2. ad Nepotian. [Ep. 52.]



I have shewn he does<sup>x</sup>; he must judge that his parents had run a very sinful hazard, if they had let him continue so long, and then take so long a journey, before they had procured him baptism. And then also the picture which they have lately made in the chapel dedicated to this saint, in the church of the Invalids in France, representing his baptism at adult age, will prove a mistake.

Sect. 11. Of St. Austin.

His father was a heathen when this his son was born; and a long time after.

I. There is no instance of this nature more commonly urged than that of St. Austin: and yet none that is a more palpable mistake.

That he was about thirty-three years old when he was baptized,<sup>288.</sup> is clear: he himself gives a large account of it in his book (A.D. 388.) of Confessions<sup>y</sup>. As he observed<sup>z</sup>, that that book was in his lifetime more generally read than any other of his works; so it has happened ever since. That, of all other, having had the fortune to be translated into many vulgar languages, every body has observed the story of his baptism: and it has cast scruples into the heads of many unlearned readers, to think, if infant-baptism were then practised, why he was not baptized in infancy.

II. As for his parents: Possidius, who a little after his death wrote his life, says in the beginning thereof; that he was ‘born of creditable and Christian parents.’ So here matters are brought to a fair issue. St. Austin, in his books which I quoted<sup>a</sup>, makes us to understand, that he never knew, heard, or read, of any Christian that was an antipædobaptist; and Pelagius his adversary, in the question of original sin, whose interest it was to have found some if there had been any, confesses that he knew of none. And yet now it seems St. Austin’s own father was one.

And this must have passed for current; if St. Austin himself had not given us a truer, or at least a more particular account of his parents than Possidius has done. But this he does in the forementioned book of his Confessions. Only there is this difference; that the story of his baptism being set down at large, is taken notice of by every body: but his father’s want of Christianity being mentioned but briefly, and by the by in one or two places, has escaped the notice of many readers.

Marshall, in his Defence of Infant Baptism<sup>b</sup>, or rather a friend of his, whom he made use of to search into matters of antiquity; ‘having himself,’ as he there says, ‘but just leisure enough to look

<sup>x</sup> Part i. ch. 15. § 1.

<sup>y</sup> Lib. ix. c. 6.

<sup>z</sup> Retractat. lib. ii. c. 6.

<sup>a</sup> Part i. ch. 19. § 17 and 30.

<sup>b</sup> Pag. 59. [edit. 4to. 1646.]

‘into these authors now and then:’ he was taken up, I suppose, with much higher authors; Calvin, Twisk, &c. But his friend has cleared this matter very well: which was easy to do. He has produced the particular places, where St. Austin tells us, that his father was no baptized Christian, nor so much as a catechumen, nor did believe in Christ, till a good while after he [St. Austin] was born. Which are these:

In the first book of his Confessions, ch. xi. speaking of the time  
 263. when he was a child, (about eight or nine years old, one  
 (A.D. 363.) must guess by the story,) he says of his father; *Ille nondum crediderat*: ‘he did not yet at that time believe.’

In the second book, ch. iii. speaking to God of the state of his  
 270. father and mother, at that time when he was, as himself  
 (A.D. 370.) mentions, sixteen years old, he says, ‘In my mother’s  
 ‘breast thou hadst already begun thy temple, and made an entrance  
 ‘for thy dwelling-place. But he [my father] was yet but a cate-  
 ‘chumen, and that but newly.’

In the ninth book, chap. ix. reckoning up in a speech to God Almighty the good deeds of his mother, who was then lately  
 289. (A.D. 389.) dead: he says, ‘Finally, she also gained over to  
 276. (A.D. 376.) ‘thee her husband in the latter end of his life.  
 ‘And had no more occasion to bewail that [crossness and ill  
 ‘nature] in him after he was *fidelis*, a baptized Christian; which  
 ‘she had endured in him before he was so.’

Yet notwithstanding all this, the life-writers copying out of Possidius, and one out of another, do to this day write him *parente utroque Christiano natum*, ‘born of parents both Christians.’ If he, or they, mean that his parents were both Christians at the time of his birth, it is a plain mistake. But if they mean that they became so before they died; it is true, but ought to have been explained so: at least by the modern writers, because of the occasion of mistake that it lays in the way of the antipædobaptists, of which there was formerly no fear.

His mother indeed was a Christian (in heart and belief at least: whether baptized or not, we are not certain) at the time of his  
 254. birth. But what could a woman do against the will of  
 (A.D. 354.) such an imperious and choleric husband, as St. Austin in many places<sup>c</sup> declares his father to have been in those times? She did what she could or dared: he says of himself<sup>d</sup>, ‘I was signed  
 ‘with the sign of Christ’s cross, and was seasoned with his salt,’  
 (ceremonies then used by Christians on their children,) ‘even from

<sup>c</sup> Confess. lib. ix. c. 9, &c.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. lib. i. c. 11.

‘the womb of my mother, who greatly trusted in thee.’ But so solemn a thing as baptism she could not, or dared not, it seems, procure to be administered against her husband’s will. For it was not a thing<sup>c</sup> then used to be huddled up in a private parlour, or in a woman’s bedchamber, or without godfathers, &c., but had many solemn circumstances, and was performed by putting the child into the water in presence of the congregation, &c., except in some particular cases of extreme haste and necessity.

It was contrary to her husband’s inclination, that she taught her child, as she nursed him, the principles of the Christian religion. As he plainly intimates when he says, ‘So I then believed, and so ‘did all our family, except my father only; who did not however so ‘far overrule the power of my mother’s godly love toward me, but ‘that I believed in Christ, though he did not.’

St. Paul persuades a believing wife to stay with an unbelieving husband<sup>e</sup>, partly for the hope there is of gaining [or converting] him: and partly, because the unbelieving party is seldom so obstinate or averse to Christianity, but that the children are allowed to be made holy [or baptized] into it. Which I shewed<sup>h</sup> to be the sense which the most ancient writers give to his words. But still this must be understood to hold for the most part, not always. There has been seldom known any husband that would yield so little to the desires or petitions of a wife as this man would, while he was a heathen. He used her not as a companion, but as an absolute servant; even by the account which the son gives of the father after his death.

In a word, St. Austin’s case was the same with that of Timothy, whose mother was a Jewess; and yet his father being a Greek, i. e. a heathen, and probably a hater of the Jewish religion, as St. Austin’s father was of the Christian, he had not been circumcised: as appears, Acts xvi. 1, 3.  *Him Paul took and circumcised him, because of the Jews that were in those quarters: for they knew all that his father was a Greek:* and therefore probably would be inquisitive whether he had been circumcised or not.

Indeed when St. Austin was a child not yet big enough to go to school, but capable to express his mind, and it happened that he fell ill of a sudden pain in his stomach, so violent that he was like to die: and he had, as he tells himself<sup>i</sup>, ‘the motion of mind, and the ‘faith to beg earnestly of his mother to get him baptized:’ she in that case would have ventured to do it, and did in great haste bestir

<sup>c</sup> See part i. ch. 15. sect. 7. § 3.

<sup>f</sup> Confess. lib. i. c. 11.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. vii.

<sup>h</sup> Part i. ch. 19. § 19. item ch. 11. § 11.

<sup>i</sup> Lib. i. cap. 11.



herself in providing for it. And it had been done, if he had not quickly mended of his pain. But there are several things considerable in this case. 1. It was a case of great extremity: it must be done now or never. 2. It was at his own desire, so that his father could not blame his mother. 3. In that case a private and clinical baptism was sufficient. 4. It is probable that his father was now mollified in that averseness that he had for the Christian religion, in which he himself, in a few years after, thought fit to become a catechumen, or hearer.

III. Afterward the scene altered in the family of Patritius, St.

271. Austin's father. For when he began to believe in Christ, (A.D. 371.) and to fear God; his son Austin began to be estranged from religion, and all good inclinations, by the heat of lust and fornication. And when his father now joined with his mother in persuading him to associate himself with the Christians, and of all the sorts of them to join with the catholic church; this advice had 273. no effect upon him at that time. For he quickly after (A.D. 373.) ran into the blasphemous sect of the Manichees<sup>k</sup>, who derided all baptism and the scriptures, and were no more Christians than the Mahometans are now.

Yet it had its effect afterward. For twelve or thirteen years after, when his father had now been dead a good while, and he disliking the Manichees, turned a sceptic, or seeker, or (as they now call them) a deist, not knowing what religion to be of; he remembered the advice of his parents, which he had formerly despised: and 'I resolved,' says he, 'to be a catechumen in the catholic church, which had been recommended to me by my parents, so long till some certainty should shew itself to my mind which way

287. 'I were best to take!.' And this proved an occasion of (A.D. 387.) his final conversion.

I the rather recite these words here, their meaning being explained by the circumstances: because taken by themselves they might strengthen that opinion, (which has been proved a mistake,) that his father was a Christian when this his son was born.

Sect. 12. Of Monica, Adeodatus, Alypius, and some others.

They do none of them make instances for this purpose.

I. Some (I think one or two) have named Monica, St. Austin's mother, among their instances; but without any kind of ground: since there is no knowing whether she were born of Christian parents, and baptized in infancy; or of heathens, and baptized at years of discretion. She had never been known if she had not been

† Lib. ii. cap. 1, 2, &c.

<sup>k</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 6.

† Lib. v. c. ult. item lib. vi. c. 11.



mother to St. Austin. Nobody mentions her, but he: and he says nothing, that I remember, of the state of her parents; but a great deal of her goodness and her care of him.

II. Adeodatus, St. Austin's son, begotten in fornication, who being fifteen years old<sup>m</sup>, was baptized together with him, is likewise mentioned without any reason. St. Austin was a Manichee when this son was born to him: and they condemned all Christian baptism of

<sup>273.</sup> infants or others, as I shall shew by and by<sup>n</sup> concerning (A.D. 373.) them and some other sects. It were absurd to expect, that he should have procured him to be baptized before he himself had renounced that opinion, and thought fit to be baptized himself. He says of him<sup>o</sup>; 'We [I and Alypius] joined him with us of the same 'age of ourselves in thy grace, [the grace of baptism,] to be educated in thy discipline, and were baptized,' &c. As Ishmael was

<sup>288.</sup> circumcised, so this youth was baptized, the same day with (A.D. 388.) his father: which was at Easter, anno 388.

III. When I have spoken of Alypius, whom St. Austin mentions as baptized together with him; I hope I have done. It is only in compliance to Mr. Tombes, that he need be mentioned at all. He had observed that he was baptized when he was adult, and so makes him an instance for this purpose<sup>p</sup>, without giving any proof or pretence of it, that his parents were Christians. He might in a week's time have collected a hundred such instances of persons baptized at man's age, whose parents are utterly unknown, as Alypius' are: only people have generally concluded that they were heathens, because they did not baptize their children.

And there happen to be also some more particular proofs in his case. As that, before his conversion, he abhorred or scorned the name of Christ: as St. Austin gives us to understand, when after having given God thanks for his grace in recovering him himself, he adds; 'Thou didst also subdue Alypius the brother of my soul, 'to the name of thy only-begotten, our Lord and Saviour Jesus 'Christ, which he before took in disdain to have inserted in our 'letters<sup>q</sup>.'

And also that he was so ignorant of what the Christians believed or held concerning the person of Jesus Christ. For having heard some Christians maintain that he as man had no soul, but that his divinity was in the stead of a soul to his body; and thinking this to be the common opinion of the Christians, and judging it to be absurd;

<sup>m</sup> Confess. lib. ix. c. 6.

<sup>n</sup> Chap. 5. § 3.

<sup>o</sup> Confess. lib. ix. cap. 6.

<sup>p</sup> Exercitation [about Infant-baptism,

4to. 1646. p. 28. also an Examen of Marshall's sermon, 4to. 1645.] p. 14.

<sup>q</sup> Confess. lib. ix. cap. 4.

‘he was,’ as St. Austin says<sup>r</sup>, ‘the more hardly brought over to the Christian religion. But afterwards understanding this to be the mistake of the Apollinarian heretics, he congratulated the Catholic faith,’ &c. So improbable is it that he had Christian parents.

IV. There is one Den<sup>s</sup> an antipædobaptist writer, and Danvers from him<sup>t</sup>, that mentions a great many more names yet, viz. Pancratius, Pontius, Nazarius, Thecla, Luigerus, Erasma Tusca, the three sons of Leonilla. But they do but just mention them: and if the reader would know who they are, and upon what grounds they are brought in here, he must look to that himself.

For Thecla: if they mean the famous Thecla that is said to be baptized by St. Paul, there is no doubt that she was baptized in her adult age: but there is as much probability of St. Paul’s parents having been Christians, as of her’s. For the rest, nobody knows whom they mean: for as some of those names have had several persons called by them, so some have had none at all that I know of.

What I have to add in this second edition to this and the foregoing chapter is, that whereas one Mr. Delaune<sup>u</sup> an antipædobaptist, in a ‘Plea for Nonconformists,’ written in King Charles II.’s time, had heaped together a great number of quotations out of modern authors, who had reported the ancient opinions or usages to be, in any respect whatsoever, different from the tenets or usages of the church of England; and among the rest had brought in at p. 11. all that he could rake together against infant-baptism, (taking them, I suppose, out of Danvers,) viz. the sayings of bishop Taylor, Grotius, Lud. Vives, Daillé, Dr. Field, Mr. Baxter, Walafrid Strabo, Boemus; which among several others I recited in the last chapter: and whereas there were none of these quotations about infant-baptism, or the other subjects, but had been considered and answered by learned men of the church, (though not in any particular answer to Delaune’s pamphlet, but on other occasions,) and consequently, unless the nonconformists could produce some new matter, there seemed to have been said all that was necessary to restore peace and union: now the other day, a certain busy writer, for dissension, instead of offering any new thing, reprinted Delaune’s book, with

<sup>r</sup> Confess. lib. vii. c. 19.

<sup>s</sup> [A treatise of Baptism; wherein that of Believers and that of Infants is examined by the Scriptures; with the history of both out of Antiquity, &c., by John Denne.]

<sup>t</sup> Treatise of Baptism, part i. c. 7. [Cent. iv. p. 63.]

<sup>u</sup> [De Laune’s Plea for the Nonconformists; shewing the true state of their case, &c., in a letter to Dr. B. Calamy, upon his sermon called ‘Scrupulous Con-

a pompous preface, as a piece that never was answered, ‘a finished piece,’ &c., which called for an answer from the churchmen.

As for infant-baptism; there is not one word or quotation in it, but what had been fully answered: nor, as I think, on any other subject. Now at this rate, we must never be at quiet; if after objections fully proposed, and all of them publicly answered, the method be, instead of a fair reply, to reprint in a challenging way the very same objections again.

The reason I have to think that he took all the quotations he has against infant-baptism out of Danvers is, because where Danvers has mixed any forgery of his own with the quotation, there Delaune has done the like. As they do both quote Grotius in Matt. xix. 14. in the same words, but forged ones: where they make him say, ‘Infant-baptism for many hundred years was not ordinary in the Greek church;’ and where they make him speak of Constantine as an instance against infant-baptism; which he was never ignorant enough to do.

#### CHAP. IV.

*Of the Church of the ancient Britons. And of some ancient Sects, viz. the Novatians and the Donatists; which are by some thought to have been Antipædobaptists. And of the Arians.*

§ I. ABOUT twenty-six years ago, a certain antipædobaptist<sup>x</sup> writer lighted upon an argument to prove, as he thought, the ancient Christians in Britain, before the coming in of the English, to have been against infant-baptism. It is an evidence how great mistakes may arise from the misprinting of two or three words in a book; and that, in a book of so little regard as Fabian’s Chronicle. The account of the matter is this:

631. Venerable Bede wrote, in the year 731, the ‘Church  
(A.D. 731.) ‘History of the English nation:’ and tells how Austin  
500.  
(A.D. 600.) the Monk, after having made some progress in planting

‘science:’ to which is added a parallel scheme of the Pagan, Papal, and Christian rites and ceremonies. With a narrative of the remarkable trial and sufferings underwent for writing, printing, and publishing hereof; by Thomas Delaune, who died in Newgate during his imprisonment for this book. Printed twenty years ago; but being seized by the messenger of the press, was afterwards burnt

by the common hangman: and is now reprinted from the author’s original copy; and published by a protestant dissenter, who was the author’s fellow prisoner at the time of his death, for the cause of Non-conformity.—4to. London, 1704. p. 66. There appears to be a second reprint, 12mo. 1712.]

<sup>x</sup> Danvers, Treatise of Baptism, part ii. ch. 7.



Christianity among the English, made a proposal to the Britons, desiring them to join in communion with him and his new converts, and to assist in converting the English to the Christian faith. But whereas the Britons held and practised rites and traditions, in many things different from those that he then brought from the church of Rome, he insisted that they should leave off their own, and comply with his ceremonies and customs. This they refused. And, after many alterations, he at last made them this final proposal; ‘You practise  
 ‘in many things contrary to our custom, and indeed contrary to the  
 ‘custom of the universal church. And yet if you will comply with  
 ‘me in these three things; that you keep Easter at the right time:  
 ‘that you perform the office of baptizing (by which we are regene-  
 ‘rated unto God) according to the custom of the holy Roman  
 ‘church and the apostolic church; and that you together with us  
 ‘do preach the word of the Lord to the nation of the English: we  
 ‘will bear patiently with all the other things which you practise  
 ‘contrary to our customs. But they answered, that they would do  
 ‘none of these things, nor own him for their archbishop,’ &c.

This same passage is related by several others of our English historians in the after-ages, who taking it from Bede relate it to the same sense.

And among the rest, one Fabian<sup>z</sup> (a sheriff or alderman of London in king Henry the Seventh’s time, as I take it) wrote a  
 1400. Chronicle of the English history, in English. There are  
 (A. D. 1500.) two editions of his book, which I have seen in the Oxford Library. There may be more: in one of them (which is the first, I know not: I think the titlepage in one was torn) his words are to the same sense as Bede’s, being these; at fol. 56. b. ‘Then he  
 ‘sayde to them, Sen ye woll not assent to my hestes generally,  
 ‘assent ye to me specially in thre thynges: the firste is, that ye  
 ‘kepe Esterday in due fourme and tyme as it is ordeygned. The  
 ‘seconde that ye give Cristendome to the children in the manner  
 ‘that is used in the chyrche of Rome. And the thyrde, that ye  
 ‘preche unto the Anglis the worde of God,’ &c.

But in the other, these words ‘in the manner that is used in the  
 ‘chyrche of Rome’ are omitted: so that the condition stands thus,  
 ‘that ye give Christendom to the children.’ And this last men-

<sup>y</sup> Bedæ Eccl. Hist. lib. ii. c. 2.

<sup>z</sup> [The editions of Fabian’s Chronicle are as follows:

1. Printed by Pynson, in 1516. fol.
2. —by W. Rastell, in 1533. fol.
3. —by W. Bonham, in 1542. fol.

4. Printed by J. Kyngston, in 1559. fol.

The passage quoted is found at part i. ch. 119. It is read in full, as given by Wall, in the first and second editions: in the fourth it is curtailed. The third I have not met with.]



tioned edition our author having lighted on, concluded that the British church before these times had not been used to give Christendom to, or baptize children.

But he should have considered, that the account of such a thing should be taken from Bede and the other ancient historians; and not from Fabian: especially since Fabian in his preface acknowledges, (as Mr. Wills says<sup>a</sup>, for I did not read that,) that what he relates of the ancient affairs, he has from Bede: and consequently his meaning must be to express Bede's sense: and so that edition first mentioned must be as he meant it, and the omission in the other must have been by mistake, of himself, or the printer.

Fox<sup>b</sup>, and other authors that have wrote since Fabian, recite the matter as Bede does.

This argument taken from Fabian is endeavoured to be confirmed by some other collateral ones: of which none is worth the mentioning, but that from Constantine's being born among the Britons, and yet not baptized in infancy. And that is not worth it neither; considering that very few nowadays believe that he was born in Britain, and none at all but this author, and one more, that his father was a Christian<sup>c</sup>.

Pelagius was certainly born in Britain. And since he owns, (as I have produced his words<sup>d</sup>), that he 'never heard of any Christian, catholic, or sectary, that denied infant-baptism;' it is certain his own countrymen did not.

The man brings this for one of his arguments to prove that the British church must have opposed the baptizing of infants; 'because they so fully prized and faithfully adhered to the scriptures, in the worship of God, and rejected human traditions<sup>e</sup>, especially all Romish innovations,' &c. If this be any argument, then for certain the pædobaptists' cause is in a bad case.

II. The Novatians and Donatists are also brought in by the same writer, as adversaries of pædobaptism. Though both these parties of men were schismatics, and forsook the communion of the established churches in those times; yet their differences having been rather in points of discipline than of faith, and they having been at some times of the church very numerous, and the time of their flourishing within our limited period of 400 years; an argument from their practice of keeping infants unbaptized would be consider-

<sup>a</sup> Infant-Baptism asserted, p. 124. [As Wills' book has the paging misplaced in a singular manner; the numbers running thus, 1—96; 1—40; 97—288; 89—96; 37—159; observe that the passage referred to occurs on signature I i 2.]

<sup>b</sup> Martyrology, at the year 600.

<sup>c</sup> See chap. iii. sect. 2. § 2.

<sup>d</sup> Part i. chap. 19. § 30.

<sup>e</sup> [Danvers' Treatise, part ii. ch. 7. p. 228.]

able. But it would be withal a very strange discovery : since there are so many books extant, written at the same time by Cyprian, Eusebius, Optatus, Austin, &c. containing a ventilation of all the disputes between the catholics and these men, in which nothing has ever been observed that should intimate that they had any such practice or opinion. For among all the reasons that the Donatists (who rebaptized such as having been baptized by the catholics came afterward over to them) gave, why the baptism of the catholics was null, there is none that lays any blame on their giving it in infancy. But, on the contrary, St. Austin does often make use of the instance of infant-baptism, as granted by them, to overthrow some other errors that they had about baptism.

It would, I say, be a strange discovery to make now. But the proofs brought for it do fail one's expectation. For as for those out of St. Austin against the Donatists, Osiander, Fuller, Bullinger, &c. they are all by Mr. Baxter<sup>f</sup> and Mr. Wills<sup>g</sup> shewn plainly to be nothing to the purpose. And what he would prove out of Austin *de Anima* and Thomas Waldensis, that the dispute between Vincen-tius Victor and St. Austin was, whether infants ought to be bap-tized, will appear a great mistake, by reading what I have produced of the opinion of Vincentius in this collection<sup>h</sup>. For it was only whether infants that happened to die unbaptized might ever enter into the kingdom of heaven.

Yet he quotes some writers, that do indeed say the thing that he would prove. But they are only Sebastian Frank<sup>i</sup>, and one Twisk<sup>k</sup>. It is an artifice that may take with some very ignorant people, but I believe not approved by the more knowing or candid of his own opinion, to quote for some matter of ancient history, an author that is but of yesterday, and of no note or credit. When a vulgar reader sees such a quotation, he thinks it as good as the best, because he knows not the author : but one of any reading slights it for that reason, because he knows him not. It is this man's way through all his book, to quote, for the principal things that are in dispute concerning antiquity, such books as the foresaid Frank and Twisk, and one Mehrning<sup>l</sup>, and a book that he calls Dutch Martyrology<sup>m</sup>. They are all, as it seems, Dutch writers of late

<sup>f</sup> More Proofs of Infant-baptism, part ii.

<sup>g</sup> 2. chap. 4. [p. 240. &c.]

<sup>h</sup> Infant-Baptism reasserted, p. 139.

<sup>i</sup> Part i. chap. 20. § 2, 3, 4.

<sup>j</sup> [See an account of this author above, at p. 359.]

<sup>k</sup> [See above, p. 359.]

<sup>l</sup> [This book, so often quoted by Dan-

vers, under the name of Jacob Mernin-gus' (or Mehrning's) History of Baptism, I have not been able to find.]

<sup>m</sup> [Danvers cites this work as 'The Dutch Martyrology, called *The bloody Theatre*; a most elaborate and worthy Collection: written in Dutch, by Th. J. Van Braght.' I have never seen it.]

years, of the antipædobaptists' way: and if they say all that he quotes them for, they say things without any regard whether they be true or false. It is a known rule, that any modern writer affirming any thing of ancient history, without referring to some ancient author, is not at all to be heeded. These men might as well have quoted him, as he them; and it had been a like authority.

One shall not see Mr. Baxter in such a passion as he is in this place: to premise to the answers that he gives to the several quotations about these Novatians and Donatists, such sayings as<sup>n</sup>, 'Utterly false:' 'False again:' 'This is something, were it true;' 'but it is such a kind of falsehood as I must not name in its due epithets:' 'Not a word of truth!:' 'No such matter in that chapter, or the whole book:' 'Blush, reader, for such a man!:' 'Mr. Bagshaw is now quite overdone in the quality of untruths,' &c.

I produced in the Collection<sup>o</sup> a canon of a council of Carthage, wherein they decree what is to be done in reference to that question; whether they should admit to any office of the clergy those who in their infancy, before they could judge of the error, had been baptized by the Donatists, and afterward came over to the church. Cassander<sup>p</sup> and Mr. Cobbet<sup>q</sup> had brought this as a proof, that the Donatists, as well as catholics, baptized infants. This writer says<sup>r</sup>, 'that is but a supposition at best that they might do so.' But I doubt any one else will take it for a plain supposition that they ordinarily did so.

That challenge of St. Austin, and confession of Pelagius, produced before<sup>s</sup>, that they never knew nor heard of any heretics or schismatics that were against the baptizing of infants, must be an undeniable proof that neither of these two sects were so: since a considerable body of each of them were remaining in those parts where these two men lived: and all their particular opinions were the subject of every day's disputations. And St. Austin, in his book of Sects, wrote a particular of their tenet<sup>t</sup>, as well as of all the rest. And yet since my last edition, an antipædobaptist writer, Mr. Davye<sup>u</sup>, has printed over again what Danvers had said of the

<sup>n</sup> More Proofs, &c. p. 249, &c. and 241, &c.

<sup>o</sup> Part i. chap. 16. §. 1, 2.

<sup>p</sup> [See Georgius Cassander, *De Baptismo Infantium*, 8o. Colon. 1563. reprinted in his *Opera Omnia*, fol. Paris. 1616.]

<sup>q</sup> See 'A just Vindication of the Covenant and Church-estate of Children of Church-members; as also of their Right unto Baptism.' By Thomas Cobbet,

'teacher of the Church of Lyn in New-England.' 4o. London, 1648. p. 296. [The passage referred to occurs at p. 291.]

<sup>r</sup> Treat. of Baptism, part ii. chap. 7.

<sup>s</sup> Part i. chap. 19. § 17 and 30.

<sup>t</sup> *De Hæresibus*, cap. 69. [Op. tom. viii. p. 21. ed. Benedict.]

<sup>u</sup> [Mr. Thomas Davye (of Leicester), in a book called, 'The Baptism of Adult Believers only vindicated.' 8vo. 1719.]



Britions, the Novatians, the Donatists, denying infant-baptism; without having a word to say to the confutation of that pretence by Baxter, Wills, &c. or in my book; which yet he had seen. And hunting further for some antipædobaptists among the schismatics of those times, has laid a claim to the Pelagians: who, when they were expiring, left behind them (as I have shewn part i. ch. 19. and a little more fully in a Defence of this book) an eternal anathema against any that should deny infant-baptism, or say that they denied it.

III. The Arians are by some catholic writers styled anabaptists. These also made a considerable body of men in some part of our period of time, viz. of the first 300 years after the apostles. Especially in the time of the emperors, Constantius and <sup>240.</sup> (A.D. 340.) Valens; who took almost the same methods to force their <sup>270.</sup> (A.D. 370.) subjects to turn Arians, or at least to hold communion with the Arians, as the French king does at this day to force his to turn papists, or go to mass. If the writer whom we have been following for some time, had ever heard of, or lighted on, those places where the Arians are called anabaptists; I am persuaded he would have increased the catalogue of his friends with one sect more. I would not have the antipædobaptists claim any acquaintance with so ill company: and therefore do give them an account of the reason why they had that name. It was not for that they had any thing to say against infant-baptism: but because they, as well as the Donatists before them, did use to baptize over again such as came from the catholic church to them; not for that they had been baptized in infancy, (for if they had been baptized at man's age it was all one,) but for that they had received baptism from the catholics, whom the Arians did so hate, that they would not own any baptism given by them to be good. This is evident both from St. Austin, who recites their tenets<sup>u</sup>, and also from an oration of St. Ambrose, which I mentioned before, against Auxentius the Arian<sup>x</sup>: where he says, 'Cur igitur rebaptizandos,' &c. 'Why does 'Auxentius say, that the faithful people, who have been baptized in 'the name of the Trinity, must be baptized again?' And this is all that the word *anabaptist* signifies; 'one that baptizes over again 'those that have been baptized already.' And therefore those of the antipædobaptists that know the signification of the word, do not own the name; they denying theirs to be rebaptizing.

The instance of the emperor Valens, that I gave before<sup>y</sup>, (whom

<sup>u</sup> De Hæresibus, cap. 49.      <sup>x</sup> [Apud Op. tom. ii. p. 874. sect. 37. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>y</sup> Part i. chap. 12. sect. 9, 10.

St. Basil exhorted to have his child baptized by the catholic bishops, but he chose to have it done by the Arians,) is a clear proof that Arians as well as catholics baptized infants.

## CHAP. V.

*Of some heretics that denied all water-baptism. And of others that baptized the same person several times over. The dispute in the catholic church concerning rebaptizing. Of the Paulianists, whom the Nicene Fathers ordered to be baptized anew, if they would come into the church.*

I. WHAT St. Austin and Pelagius said of all heretics (that they had ever heard of) allowing infant-baptism, must be understood of such as allowed any baptism at all. For otherwise, they knew there were some sects that renounced all use of it to any persons, infants or others. And St. Austin had himself been of one of them. And he does indeed express a limitation that is of the same effect, when he says, ‘All that do receive the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, do own infant-baptism for the remission of sins<sup>z</sup>:’ for those that denied all water-baptism did also generally renounce the scriptures.

It may be worth the while to gratify the Quakers with a short catalogue of all their ancient friends in that point of denying baptism, that were within our period.

The historians that have given us the tale of all the heresies they had heard of, have been much too liberal of that name. For they have given the name of heretics to some that deserved a worse, and should have been called infidels; and also to some that deserved one not so bad, and should have gone for distracted people.

Of the first sort were the Valentinians, who made use of the name of Christ only to mock and abuse the religion: their own religion being a mixture of idolatry, magic and lascivious rites. They blasphemed the scriptures as false<sup>a</sup>; and the catholics as carnal; and both, as giving a wrong account of Jesus Christ, of whom they made quite another sort of being.

Of these Irenæus reckons up several sorts, which had their several opinions concerning baptism. I gave a general account of them before<sup>b</sup>, out of the 18th [21st of the Benedictine edition]

<sup>z</sup> See the words, part i. chap. 19. sect. 17.

<sup>a</sup> Irenæus, lib. iii. cap. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Part i. chap. 21. § 2.

chapter of Irenæus' first book: and here you shall have Irenæus' words.

Having premised, that 'in this sect there are as many ἀπολυτρώ-  
'σεις, redemptions, [or, ways of baptism,] as there are ringleaders,' he adds,

'Some of them dress up a bride-chamber, and perform mystical ceremonies with certain profane words to those whom they initiate; and call this a "spiritual marriage," which they say is made according to the likeness of the "heavenly conjugations."

'Others bring the party to the water, and as they are baptizing use these words: "In the name of the unknown Father of all things: in the truth the mother of all things: in him that came down on JESUS: in the union and redemption and communion of powers."

'Some, that they may amuse those whom they initiate, use certain Hebrew words; *Basema, Chamasi, Baæanora*, &c.

'Others of them again express their redemption [or baptism] thus; "The name that is hidden from every deity, dominion, and truth: which Jesus of Nazareth put on in the zones of light," &c.

'And he that is initiated [or baptized] answers, "I am confirmed and redeemed: and I redeem my soul from this ÆON and all that comes of it, in the name of IAO," &c.

'Then they anoint the baptized person with balsam, for they say this ointment is the type of that sweetness which surpasses all things.' [Note, that this is the first mention of Chrism that is any where read of. And since I shall shew presently, at chap. ix. that it was used by the catholics from testimonies of near the same date as this; one may conclude that it came from some principle universally received by all Christians, catholic or heretic.]

'Some of them say, that it is needless to bring the person to the water at all: but making a mixture of oil and water, they pour it on his head, using certain profane words, much like them before-mentioned: and they say that that is redemption [or baptism]. This sort use balsam also.

'But others of them rejecting all these things, say, "that the mystery of the unspeakable and invisible power ought not to be performed by visible and corruptible elements: nor that of incomprehensible and incorporeal things be represented by sensible and corporeal things. But that the knowledge of the unspeakable majesty is itself perfect redemption [or baptism]." These last, I suppose, will be owned for friends.

II. Tertullian wrote his book of baptism, that he might put a



100. stop to the heresy that had been set on foot by one Quintilla, a woman preacher, that had been at Carthage a little before; and had, as he says<sup>c</sup>, seduced a great many. The main of her preaching was against water-baptism: 'that it was needless: 'that faith alone was sufficient,' &c. She had come out, as he understood, from the sect of the Caians. That sect, as impious as it was in other things<sup>d</sup>, did not deny baptism, that we read of. She had, it seems, added that herself. He there largely sets forth the falseness of her doctrine, and also her masculine impudence in usurping the office of a preacher of it, though it had been never so true.

III. The Manichees are the next: as little deserving the name of Christians as the rest, and less than the Mahometans do. 200. (A.D. 300.) They made the same account of their Manes, as these do of Mahomet. They owned Christ to be a true prophet, as these do; and Peter, Paul, John, &c. to have been his true apostles. But they said (as these also do) that the books which we have of theirs are no true records, but had been falsified. And the same absurdity which the Christians now do urge against these, St. Austin urged against them: 'that if they plead our copies are falsified, they ought 'at least to produce such as are truer.' And he, who had been once seduced by them, tells us what they held as to baptism<sup>e</sup>, 'they say 'that baptism in water does nobody any good: neither do they 'baptize any of the proselytes whom they delude into their sect.'

Yet St. Cyril of Jerusalem<sup>f</sup> intimates, that they had something instead of baptism. 'Their baptism,' says he, 'is such as I dare 'not describe before men and women. I am afraid to tell in what 'matter it is that they dipping a fig give it to their wretched 'people.' Yet he intimates what it was: but it is so beastly that I will not do that.

IV. The Messalians seem to have been no other but a sort of enthusiastic people, who leaving off their employments, 260. (A.D. 360.) thought it necessary, or at least pleasing to God, to spend all their time in prayer and rapture. And thereby became subject to many hypochondriac conceits. Epiphanius and St. Austin speaking of them in their catalogues, say nothing of their denying baptism. But Theodoret<sup>g</sup>, and the *Historia Tripartita*<sup>h</sup> out of him, repeats their sense thus; 'that there is no profit accruing to the

<sup>c</sup> De Baptismo, cap. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Epiphanius de Caianis, Hæres. 38. [sive 18.]  
—Op. tom. i. p. 276. edit. Petavii, 1622.]

<sup>e</sup> De Hæresibus, cap. 46. [Op. tom. viii. p. 17. C. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>f</sup> Catech. 6. [cap. 33.]

<sup>g</sup> Lib. iv. cap. 11.

<sup>h</sup> Cassiodorus, Hist. Trip. lib. vii. cap. 11.

‘baptized by baptism: but that fervent prayer only expels the ‘Devil.’ And says, ‘that the most noted men of their sect were ‘Dadoes, (or Daodes, or Dadosius,) Sabbas, (or Sebas,) Adelphius, ‘Hermas, Symeones.’

What does Mr. Danvers do, but put down these men<sup>i</sup> for ‘eminent ‘persons that in the fourth century bore witness against infant- ‘baptism?’ And he cites for authority the foresaid place; *Hist. Tripart.* lib. vii. cap. 11, into which whoever looks will see that the error there laid to their charge is in the words that I have set down, and no other: which express the opinion of the Quakers, not of the antipædobaptists.

But he quotes also Sebastian Frank (one of the Dutch blades I mentioned a little above<sup>k</sup>) to confirm that this Dadosius, Sebas, &c. were eminent witnesses against infant-baptism. So that it is to be hoped for Danvers’ credit, that he had never looked into *Historia Tripartita*, but had taken the quotation on the credit of Frank, which must be very small.

But if one read the whole passage in Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. cap. 11, and *Hæretic. Fabul.* lib. iv. cap. *de Messalianis*, it is plain that the men were distracted. For they pretended that by force of their prayer they could bring the Devil out of themselves, sometimes by spittle, and sometimes by blowing their nose: they would dance about, and say they were treading upon him: they would imitate archers, and then say they had shot him. And that after the Devil was gone from them, they could see the holy Trinity with bodily eyes. They were also full of prophecies and revelations. And St. Hierome, who had lived in Syria among them, says<sup>l</sup>, that they said of themselves, that ‘when they were come to the top of their ‘perfection, they were beyond any possibility of sinning, in thought, ‘or by ignorance.’

The historians that have encumbered the church registers with these, and some other such sorts of sects, would at the same rate, if they had had in any country at any time a dozen or two of our Muggletonians<sup>m</sup>, have made a considerable sect of them, to be talked of in church-history to the end of the world. Whereas such

<sup>i</sup> Treatise of Baptism, part ii. chap. 7.

<sup>k</sup> Chap. iv. § 2.

<sup>l</sup> Prolog. ad Dialog. contra Pelag.

<sup>m</sup> [An obscure religious sect, which arose in England during the times of the Commonwealth: so denominated from their leader Lodowick Muggleton, a journeyman tailor, who with J. Reeves his associate pretended to high gifts of

prophecy, and gave out that they were God’s two witnesses, who were to appear shortly before the end of the world.

For a brief account of these enthusiasts consult the Supplement to Collier’s Dictionary; and a note to the article Swedenborgians, in Evans’ Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World, p. 260. edit. 1811.]

men, especially when inconsiderable for number, should be pitied in their lifetime, and kept dark; and their wild opinions forgot after they are dead. And this method would have lessened the catalogues of sects almost by one half.

Somen<sup>n</sup> do reckon besides these, the Ascodruti, and the Archontici, as sects that used no baptism. But Theodoret says<sup>o</sup>, that the Ascodruti were a branch of the Valentinians; and the Archontici of them: which I am very glad of, being weary of reckoning any more.

St. Austin says<sup>p</sup>, a sect called Seleucians, or Hermians, do not admit of water-baptism, nor of the resurrection.

These are the sects that have renounced all use of baptism.

V. Some on the other extreme have administered it several times to the same person; and are therefore properly called anabaptists. I speak now of those that practised formal anabaptism, i. e. what they themselves owned to be anabaptism, or rebaptizing of the same person. And of such I remember no more in ancient times, but the

<sup>40.</sup> Marcionists. Marcion taught, as Epiphanius says<sup>q</sup>, that (A. D. 140.) ‘it is lawful to give three baptisms: so that if any one ‘fall into sin after his first baptism, he may have a second; and a ‘third, if he fall a second time.’ And here it seems he stopped his hand. Yet Epiphanius says, that he had heard that his ‘followers ‘went further, and gave more than three, if any one desired it.’

He that writes the Present State of Muscovy says<sup>r</sup>, their way is, that ‘persons of age, who change their religion, and embrace the ‘Muscovite faith; nay even Muscovites, who having changed their ‘religion in another country, are willing to return to their own ‘communion, must first be rebaptized.’ He speaks also of some vagabond people among them, called Chaldeans, who do customarily, and by a sort of license, practise great extravagancies from the 18th of December to Epiphany; during which time they are excluded the church: but ‘on twelfth day, when their license is expired, they are rebaptized, (some of them having been baptized ten ‘or twelve times,) and looked upon as good Christians.’ But Brerewood<sup>s</sup>, ch. 23, says, (and quotes Possevin for it,) that they use not this baptism on twelfth day, as a sacrament, or as any purifica-

<sup>n</sup> Epiph. de Archonticis, [Hæres. xx. vol. xl. Op. tom. i. p. 291.]

<sup>o</sup> Hæret. fab. lib. i. cap. 10. [Op. tom. iv. p. 201.]

<sup>p</sup> De Hær. cap. 59. [Op. tom. viii. p. 20.]

<sup>q</sup> Hæres. 42. [seu 22.] Marcionistæ. [Sect. 3. apud Op. tom. i. p. 302, &c.]

<sup>r</sup> Dr. Crull, chap. 11. [The Ancient and

Present State of Muscovy, by J. Crull, M.D. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1698. vol. i. p. 194.]

<sup>s</sup> [Enquiries touching the diversity of Languages and Religions, through the chief parts of the world, by Edw. Brerewood, 4to. Lond. 1622. p. 169.]



tion of themselves; but only as a memorial of Christ's baptism received on that day in Jordan: and that the Abassenes do the same thing upon the same day upon the same account. So that it is to be hoped that Dr. Crull may be mistaken in the reason of their practice. And for what he says here of their rebaptizing all that came over to their religion; I have occasion to note something on it, at chap. ix. § 2.

Mr. Thevenot also tells a story<sup>t</sup> of some people called Sabæans, living at Bassora in Arabia, that are, as he there says, improperly called Christians, that do reiterate the baptism which they use. But it is not the Christian baptism, nor given in that form. They have, he says, no knowledge of Jesus Christ, but that he was a servant to John Baptist, and baptized by him; and of the books of the gospel no knowledge at all. But however it be with any late sects, in ancient times there were, as I said, no sects that did this but the Marcionists.

I know that the name of anabaptists, or rebaptizers, was then by the catholics imputed to several heretics, and by some churches of the catholics to other catholic churches. But they that were so censured did none of them own, as the Marcionists did, that what they did was rebaptizing: they all pleaded that the baptism which  
 210. the party had received before was null and void; as being  
 (A. D. 310.) administered in a corrupt church, or by heretical bishops, &c.

The antipædobaptists now hold the same plea: but the ground of the plea is very different; for I never read, and I believe they cannot produce, any instance of any one that pleaded baptism to be void, because it was given in infancy. And as they disown the name of anabaptists, or rebaptizers; so I have no where given it to them: as, on the contrary, I do not give them the name of Baptists, nor of the baptized people; for that is to cast a reproach upon their adversaries, as concluding that they are not so. Every party, while the matter continues in dispute, ought to give and take such names as cast no reproach on themselves nor their opponents, but such as each of them own: and such are the names that I use.

VI. The dispute about rebaptizing, or the imputation thereof, was one that troubled the church in former times as much as any. Many sects of heretics and schismatics were so bitter against the catholics, that they said; All things were so corrupt among them, that baptism, or any other office done by them, was null and void: and therefore they baptized afresh all that came over from the

<sup>t</sup> Voyage, tom. ii. p. 331. [Travels into the Levant, p. ii. book 3. chap. 11. p. 164. edit. fol. Lond. 1687.]

church to them. And many churches of the catholics were even with them, and observed the same course with all that came over from them. But others would not: but said, that baptism, though given by the schismatics, was valid. And this came at last to be a bone of contention between the catholics themselves: each party finding fault with the other's way of receiving schismatics into the church.

In St. Cyprian's time, the Christian world was divided into halves  
 150. on this point. For he, and all the churches of Africa,  
 (A. D. 250.) some of Egypt, and many in Asia, received not heretics into the church without a new baptism; and one of the apostolic canons (can. 37, alias 46) orders, that they be not otherwise received. But the Christians at Rome, and most in Europe, used only to give them a new confirmation, or laying on of hands; and so admit them.

Afterward, this came to be a rule<sup>n</sup>; that 'they that came to the  
 200. catholic church from such sects as used not the right  
 (A. D. 300.) form of baptism, [*in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,*] must be baptized at their admission: 'but they that in any sect had been baptized with those words, should be adjudged to have already true baptism.'

VII. Yet the Paulianists were excepted from this general rule: though they, as Athanasius informs<sup>x</sup>, used the said form of baptizing; yet the council of Nice expressly decreed<sup>y</sup>, 'that  
 225. (A. D. 325.) they must be baptized anew, if they would come into the catholic church.' The reason seems to be; that they, though using the same words, of *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, yet meant by them so different a thing, (for they took *the Son* to be a mere man,) that they were judged not to baptize into the same faith, nor in the name of the same God, that the catholics and others did.

This shews the abhorrence that the Christians at that time had of  
 224. an opinion that would now grow fashionable. And Pho-  
 (A. D. 324.) tinus, a little after, in the time of Constantius, did no sooner make an attempt to revive this heresy, but that both the catholics and Arians (though they could hardly agree in any thing else) agreed in condemning him and his opinion: 'which act of  
 'theirs,' says Socrates the historian<sup>z</sup>, 'was approved of all men,

<sup>u</sup> Basil. de Spiritu Sancto, cap. 1. [Op. tom. ii. p. 291. edit. F. Ducaei, 1638. tom. iii. p. 1. edit. Benedict.—Or rather, see his first canonical epistle to Amphilochius, being the 188th in vol. iii. of the Bened. edit. p. 268—270; canon 1.]

<sup>x</sup> Orat. 3. contra Arianos, [Orat. 4. cap. 30—36. Op. tom. i. p. 640, &c. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>y</sup> Can. 19.

<sup>z</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 29.

‘both at that time present, and also in times following.’ He means, that all of the most differing parties and opinions agreed that such a doctrine was abominable. And Theodoret, who lived at the same time with Socrates, having reckoned up in one book all the sects that had attributed to our Saviour no other nature than human, 330. (A.D. 430.) says in the last chapter thereof<sup>a</sup>, ‘that they were at that time all extinct and forgotten; so that the names of them were known to but few.’ And so they have continued till of very late years: unless the modern abettors of them will plead, that the succession of their doctrine has been preserved, from the year 600, in the churches of Mecca and Medina.

VIII. It appears how conscious these men are, that all antiquity is against them, by their setting themselves so bitterly against it. There is no sect of men now in the world that do use such endeavours, and some of them very unfair ones, to bring all the ancient Christians and their writings into a general disrepute. They employ and encourage some persons to read the Fathers, only to weed and cull out of them some sayings, which, taken by themselves, may be represented either ridiculous, insipid, or heterodox. They also collect out of history, all the faults or miscarriages that any ancient writer has been charged with: and making a bundle of this stuff, part true, part false, they present it to their proselytes, and even to the world, as the life of such a Father<sup>b</sup>; or as a specimen of such a Father’s works. They give a great many reasons why it is not worth the while to read, study, or translate the discourses of these ancients: that time is much better spent in reading the modern criticisms upon the text of Scripture, which do often give the sense thereof such a turn, as to make our religion to be a very different thing from that which has been all along the religion of Christians. If they can gain this point, to alienate people from any regard to the doctrine and faith of the primitive times, they make a good step, not only for their own turn to overthrow the doctrine of the Trinity, but also for the advantage of their next successors the deists, who can with a much better grace argue against a religion that has been altered in its most fundamental points, than against one that has continued the same since the time that it was once delivered to the saints.

But among all the reproaches cast on the Fathers, there is none so scandalous and destructive of the credit both of the Fathers and of Christianity itself, as is one that they have lately set abroad;

<sup>a</sup> Hæret. Fab. lib. ii. [c. 11. Op. tom. iv. p. 224.]

<sup>b</sup> [See a note on this subject above, p. 218.]



viz. that the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in whom we believe, and in whose name we are baptized, is (as it is understood, explained, and held by the said Fathers) a doctrine of tritheism, or of believing in three Gods. I may repeat their sayings: for they are industriously handed about in the English tongue. One of them says thus<sup>c</sup>:

‘They [the Fathers] thought the three hypostases [or persons in ‘the Trinity] to be three equal Gods, as we should now express it.’ And again<sup>d</sup>; ‘Not to recur to the Fathers, whose opinion was quite ‘different from that which is now received: as who, properly ‘speaking, affirmed that there were three consubstantial Gods, as ‘has been shewn by Petavius, Curcellæus, Cudworth, and others.’ And again; ‘Who, to speak the truth, were tritheists rather than ‘asserters of the present opinion: for they believed the unity of ‘substance, not the singularity of number, as Tertullian speaks; ‘that is, that the substance of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was ‘specifically one, but numerically three: as the learned men I ‘before mentioned have clearly shewn, and might more largely be ‘demonstrated.’

This spittle of an outlandish author our English Socinians greedily licked up: and to any thing that was offered out of the Fathers they have in their late books opposed this; that ‘the ‘Fathers held only a specifical unity of the Divine nature, and the ‘persons to be as so many individuals<sup>e</sup>.’ This they repeat often, and refer to Curcellæus’ undeniable proofs of it. Of which bishop Stillingfleet taking notice, did in his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, ch. vi. answer and refute particularly all the instances brought by Curcellæus, in a large discourse, from p. 76, to p. 100<sup>f</sup>, bringing, as he expresses it himself, ‘undeniable proofs’ that Curcellæus had mistaken their meaning.

IX. Notwithstanding this, what does the foresaid author do, but three years after the publication of Stillingfleet’s book, writing some *Critical Epistles*, loads them with the same slanders repeated, without taking any notice that they had been answered? saying, ‘that ‘the Nicene Fathers thought the Divine nature is no otherwise one

<sup>c</sup> [M. Le Clerc, in his] *Supplement to Dr. Hammond’s Annot. on 1 John v. 6.* [4to. London, 1699.]

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* Preface. [Or see the Latin edition, *Novum Test. Hammondii et Clerici*, 2 tom. fol. Francofurti, 1714. tom. ii. p. 594. § 5.]

<sup>e</sup> *Defence of the brief History of the Unitarians*, [against Dr. Sherlock’s An-

swer, 4to. Lond. 1691.] p. 5. Answer to *La Moth* [viz. *Reflections on two discourses concerning the Divinity of our Saviour*, written by Monsieur Lamothe, in French, and done into English. Written to J. S. 4to. London, 1693. pp. 24.] Letter to the University, p. 13.

<sup>f</sup> [Of the second edition, 8vo. London, 1697.]

‘than specifically, but that it is in number threefold: as Petavius, Curcellæus, Cudworth, and others have proved by such arguments, as that there can nothing be said in answer to themg.’

In another of the said epistles he repeats the same slander, and would father it on some learned men in England. He says, ‘learned men in England, and elsewhere, do not forbear to say openly, that the Nicene Fathers believed three eternal and equal essences in God; and not one God in number<sup>h</sup>.’ And having mentioned, that several protestant churches have received the Nicene Creed into their public confessions, he adds: ‘If then they will stand to this part of their confession, they must own that they believe three eternal natures, and renounce the numerical unity of God. Or if they will not do that, they must expunge that article of their confession, in which they own the Nicene faith.’

And these letters he ventures to send into England, directed to bishops there, who he must needs think abominated such exorbitant sayings; and who could easily, if he had had the prudence to consult them first, have satisfied him that one of their brethren had long ago answered all those proofs of Curcellæus with which he made such a noise: Petavius’ and Cudworth’s instances being not so considerable, nor so maliciously urged.

Our church is not wont to take such affronts, and continue silent under them, unless when the party is accounted of so little credit as to be not worth the answering. The learned men therein (and especially the most learned person against whom these epistles were directed) would probably have spent some pains to vindicate the church of Christ from so foul a slander, but that they thought the falsehood of this imputation of the Fathers had been already sufficiently shewn.

Here I did in the first edition take notice, that some passages written a great while ago by a right reverend bishop, (of which others also had taken notice before,) did seem to incline to this opinion of Mr. Le Clerc concerning the Fathers. Of which I have no more to say, than what I have said in the preface of this second edition<sup>i</sup>.

X. Mr. Le Clerc brings some pretended proofs of the tritheism of the ancients, of his own collection: of which bishop Stillingfleet took no notice, they being not in Curcellæus. They are sayings, or

<sup>g</sup> Epist. 3. ad Episcop. Sarisb. p. 108. [See Jo. Clerici Epistole Criticæ, (forming the third volume of his *Ars critica*) 12mo. Amstelodami, 1700.]

<sup>h</sup> Id. in Epist. 5. ad Episcop. Vigorn. p. 177.

<sup>i</sup> [For some account of the particulars here alluded to, see a note attached to the preface of this edition.]

<sup>j</sup> [In his adnotationes in loc. 1 Joh. v. 6. p. 594, edit. 1714.]

pieces of sayings, of the Fathers, so partially picked out and unfairly represented, that at that rate one might abuse and misrepresent any writer; even the Scripture itself. He mentions in the words before recited, a scrap of a sentence of Tertullian in his book against Praxeas c. 25<sup>k</sup>. The whole sentence runs thus: ‘Ita connexus  
 100. ‘Patris in Filio, et Filii in Paracleto tres efficit, cohæ-  
 (A.D. 200.) ‘rentes alterum ex altero; qui tres unum sint, non unus:  
 ‘quomodo dictum est, *Ego et Pater unum sumus*; ad substantiæ  
 ‘unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem.’ ‘Thus the connexion  
 ‘of the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Holy Spirit, makes  
 ‘that there are three that cohere in one another; which three are  
 ‘*unum*, one substance, not *unus*, one person: as it is said, *I and the*  
 ‘*Father are unum, one substance*; to denote the unity of substance,  
 ‘not the singularity of number. That is, (as Mr. Le Clerc says,)  
 ‘the substance of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is specifically  
 ‘one, but numerically three.’ But that is (as any one else will say)  
 to denote the unity of substance, not the singularity of number of the  
 persons; or, that the persons are not numerically one, though the  
 substance is. For it is to be noted, that this book was written  
 against that error of Praxeas, whereby he taught that Father, Son,  
 and Holy Ghost are one person: to confirm which he brought that  
 place of Scripture, *I and the Father are one*. Tertullian tells him,  
 our Saviour’s word there is *unum*, which denotes one substance; not  
*unus*, which would have denoted one person.

And though the design of the book be, as I said, to maintain  
 that side of the question; that there are in some sense three in  
 the Godhead, (as Praxeas had maintained the contrary, carrying the  
 arguments for the unity further than he ought,) yet even in this  
 book there are more than twenty passages in which Tertullian aims  
 to express as well as he can, (for they had not then so determinate  
 an use of words,) a numerical unity of the substance, or essence.  
 Particularly this passage<sup>l</sup>:

‘Igitur unus Deus Pater, et alius absque eo non est: quod ipse  
 ‘inferens, non Filium negat, sed alium Deum: cæterum alius a  
 ‘patre filius non est.—Atquin si nominasset illum, separasset, ita  
 ‘dicens: “Alius præter me non est, nisi Filius meus.” Alium  
 ‘enim etiam Filium fecisset, quem de aliis exceperisset. Puta solem  
 ‘dicere: “Ego sol, et alius præter me non est, nisi radius meus:”  
 ‘nonne denotasses vanitatem? quasi non et radius in sole deputetur.’

‘So there is one God the Father, and there is no other beside  
 ‘him: which he affirming does not exclude his Son, but any other

<sup>k</sup> [Op. p. 515.]<sup>l</sup> Ch. 18. [p. 510. edit. Priorii.]



‘ God : and the Son is not another from the Father.—It would  
 ‘ have been to separate [or distinguish] him, if he had named him,  
 ‘ and had said, “There is no other beside me, except my Son.” It  
 ‘ had been to make his Son another, whom he had excepted out of  
 ‘ those that are others. Suppose the sun should say : “I am the  
 ‘ sun, and there is no other beside me, except my light [or ray],”  
 ‘ would you not judge it absurd ? As if the light were not counted  
 ‘ to the sun itself.’

To mention one passage more of the said book, chap. xxix. where  
 he is answering the argument of Praxeas, who had said ; that since  
 the essence [or substance] of the Father and the Son is one and the  
 same, the Son could not suffer but the Father must suffer too. And  
 where Tertullian, if he had thought the essence of the Son to be only  
 specifically the same with that of the Father, and not numerically,  
 could not have forbore to answer so. But he answers thus ; that  
 the Divine nature did not suffer at all : but if it had, that argument  
 would not have concluded. ‘ Nam et fluvius, si aliqua turbulentia  
 ‘ contaminatur, quanquam una substantia de fonte decurrat, nec  
 ‘ secernatur a fonte, tamen fluvii injuria non pertinebit ad fontem.  
 ‘ Et licet aqua fontis sit quæ patiatur in fluvio, dum non in fonte  
 ‘ patitur, sed in fluvio, non fons patitur, sed fluvius qui ex fonte est.  
 ‘ Ita, etsi spiritus Dei quid pati posset in Filio, quia tamen non in  
 ‘ Patre pateretur, sed in Filio, Pater passus non videretur. Sed  
 ‘ sufficit nihil spiritum Dei passum suo nomine.’

‘ For if a stream be puddled with any disturbance, though it be  
 ‘ the same substance that runs from the spring, and be not distinct  
 ‘ from the spring, yet the hurt of the stream will not affect the  
 ‘ spring. And though it be the water of the spring which suffers  
 ‘ in the stream, yet so long as it suffers in the stream, and not in  
 ‘ the spring, the spring does not suffer, but the stream which is  
 ‘ derived from the spring. So though the Spirit [or Deity] of God  
 ‘ could suffer any thing in the Son, yet so long as it suffered not in  
 ‘ the Father, but the Son, the Father would not be said to suffer.  
 ‘ But it is sufficient [to take off your argument] that the divinity  
 ‘ suffered not at all in its own nature.’

If he had thought the essence to be only specifically the same, he  
 would not have gone so far for an answer ; the aim thereof is to  
 shew, that though it be numerically the same in both persons, yet  
 something might be said of one of them, which could not be said of  
 the other.

But in other books the same writer affirms the numerical unity of  
 essence more plainly, and in the terms of the question, though not

then in common use. For in his Apology, chap. xxi. he says, that the λόγος is *de Spiritu Spiritus, et de Deo Deus*<sup>k</sup>: *Modulo alter, non numero*. ‘Spirit of Spirit, and God of God: another in mode but ‘not in number.’ The same expression of *modulo alius ab alio* is also in the book against Praxeas, chap. ix.<sup>l</sup> and to the same purpose, chap. xiv.

It is therefore plain, that Tertullian thought that in some sense the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are numerically one: which must be in respect of the substance; for as for the persons, the design of his whole book against Praxeas is to maintain that they are three in number.

XI. Mr. Le Clerc does also endeavour to make his advantage of Gregory Nazianzen, with whom Curcellæus had not meddled. He pretended to write the Life of this Father<sup>m</sup>. One may easily see through his pretended reasons for it, and perceive that the design was to represent him as a tritheist: there are so many sayings of his <sup>260.</sup> wrested, and some false translated for that purpose. It is (A. D. 360.) true, that Gregory, in those voluminous disputations of his against the Arians and Sabellians, having no adversaries of the tritheistical opinion, and not fearing to be himself suspected of it, has some expressions in his arguments and explications unguarded on that side: yet so as that he still speaks with abhorrence of the belief of three gods. And it is a known rule of charity, that no consequences drawn from an author’s expressions are to fix on him an opinion contrary to his own express declaration: but that what he says at one or two places, seeming to favour any opinion, must be explained by others, if he have any other that are plain, full, and purposely written to the contrary.

What Mr. Le Clerc had produced from this Father was not answered, (which can no way so well be done, as by translating his works entire; a thing useful, if the modern readers of books had so much regard to antiquity as they ought: but such a regard is much lessened by such lives,) and therefore he concluded in another piece<sup>n</sup>, that Gregory was ‘undoubtedly of that opinion: the thing ‘is so clear, it cannot be questioned by those that have considered ‘it.’ He mentions also, in the Critical Epistles I spoke of before, his performance in proving this upon Gregory. Yet of all the passages produced in that Life to justify this accusation, this is the hardest: that he in a certain sermon<sup>o</sup> being busy in shewing the

<sup>k</sup> [P. 20. A. edit. Priorii.]

<sup>l</sup> [P. 504. D.]

<sup>m</sup> Biblioth. tom. xix.

<sup>n</sup> Supplement to Dr. Hammond’s An-

notations, preface.

<sup>o</sup> Orat. 37. de Spiritu Sancto. [31. in edit. Benedict. p. 556, &c.]

unfitness of all those examples of natural things which are commonly made use of to explain the Trinity, how they are all deficient and unapt in one respect or another, says: that 'he, as well as others, ' had thought of "the vein of water that feeds the spring, the spring ' or pond itself, and the stream that issues from it." Whether the ' first of these might not be compared to the Father, the second to ' the Son, and the third to the Holy Spirit. But he was afraid that ' by the similitude there would seem to be represented something ' numerically one; for that the vein, the spring, and the stream, are ' numerically one, though diversely modified or represented.'

This indeed plainly shews, that Gregory was afraid of representing the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as numerically one in some sense: but how? As having an essence numerically one? Not so: for he does in one hundred places shew that to be his real meaning. But in the Sabellian sense, which taught the persons to be numerically one, or, that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are several names of one person: and consequently that it may properly be said that the Father was incarnated, suffered, &c. He had the more reason to be cautious of saying any thing that might seem to favour that sense, because the catholics were slandered by the Arians to hold that opinion.

The one hundred places, that I spoke of, might be produced out  
 260. of Gregory's works. But there happen to be enough in  
 (A.D. 360.) that very sermon, or oration, where there is this for one. He is there answering those that thought, that from the confession of three persons in the Godhead would follow by consequence the doctrine of three Gods. He answers thus; that though there be three in whom the Godhead is, yet there is in them three but one Godhead, εἰς ὁ Θεὸς, ὅτι μὴ Θεότης<sup>p</sup> and again, ἀμέριστος ἐν μεμερισμένοις ἢ Θεότης<sup>q</sup>. But then he brings in an exception which they made against this answer of his:

*Obj.* ' But they will say, that the heathens (such of them as had ' the most advanced philosophy) held that there is but one Godhead. ' And also in the case of men, all mankind has but one common ' nature. And yet the heathens had many gods, not one only: and ' also there are many men.'

This objection comes home to the point. And here it is that Gregory must declare, whether he hold a specific or a numerical unity. Therefore observe how he answers. To the case of the heathen gods he makes a separate answer, that concerns not this

<sup>p</sup> [Orat. 31. § 14.]

<sup>q</sup> [Ibid. § 15.]



question. But to that of mankind having one common nature, and yet being many men, he answers thus :

*Sol.* ‘ But here [viz. in the case of men] the several men have no ‘ other unity than what is made by the conception of our mind,’ τὸ ἔν ἐχει μόνον ἐπινοία θεωρητόν<sup>1</sup>. He goes on a while to shew that men do in reality differ from one another ; and answers to the objection about the heathen gods : and then adds, τὸ δὲ ἡμέτερον οὐ τοιοῦτον, οὐδὲ αὕτη μερὶς τῷ Ἰακῶβ, φησὶν ὁ ἐμὸς θεολόγος. Ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐν ἑκάστων αὐτῶν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ συγκείμενον οὐχ ἥττον ἢ πρὸς ἑαυτό : τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς οὐσίας καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως<sup>2</sup>. ‘ But our Deity [or God] is not so : ‘ nor is the portion of Jacob like them, as our Theologue [meaning ‘ Jeremy, x. 16.] says : but every one of them [the persons of the ‘ Trinity] has an unity with the other, no less than that which he ‘ has with himself, by reason of the identity of essence and power.’

It is impossible any thing should be fuller to the purpose than this. For the proper difference between a numerical and a specific unity is this ; that a specific unity is only by our conception ; and the numerical unity is the only real unity. In the several men that differ in age, in shape, &c. there is something alike, viz. the essence or nature of man. This our mind abstracts from the rest, and conceives it as one in them all. But this common nature, so abstracted from the individuals, subsists only in our mind : and in reality every man has his own essence distinct in number from the rest : and if all other men were destroyed, he would have his own essence just as he has it now. And that which Gregory answers is, that several men have no other unity or sameness than what is by the conception of our mind, i. e. no other than a specific unity. But each of the three, viz. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, has an unity with the other, as much as with himself ; by identity [or sameness] of essence and of power, which must be a numerical one.

Mr. Le Clerc does indeed recite some of this answer, but in such a fashion, as shews he had a mind to mar it in the reciting. And the like he does in several other passages of Gregory. In the forementioned comparison of the three persons to the vein, the pond, and the stream, because the Greek word used by Gregory for the vein is ὀφθαλμός, he translates it, *l'œil*, ‘ an eye.’

Who ever went about to represent the Trinity by an eye, a fountain, and a stream? So great a critic should not have been ignorant that it signifies there (as Elias Cretensis in his comments on the place had noted) the vein that feeds the pond, or the hole or opening of that vein into the pond. And this yet is not so absurd,

<sup>1</sup> [Orat. § 15.]

<sup>2</sup> [Ibid. 31. § 16.]

as where a little after the same words are translated ; ‘ an eye,’ ‘ a fountain,’ and ‘ the sun.’ There are a great many other places in that Life, where Gregory is made, by curtailing or altering his words, to speak nonsense : and I wish the main design of it were not to make him speak something that is by many degrees worse. For to hold three Gods is not to be a Christian, nor any worshipper of Jehovah, but a pagan.

The very same oration furnishes us with several more proofs of the contrary. A little after the forementioned passage, he quotes<sup>154.</sup> and approves of a rule of Christian worship given by his (A.D. 254.) namesake Gregory Thaumaturgus, (or else by St. Basil, for the words are ambiguous,) *σέβειν Θεὸν τὸν Πατέρα, Θεὸν τὸν υἱόν, Θεὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τρεῖς ἰδιότητας, Θεότητες μίαν*. ‘ That ‘ we are to worship God the Father, God the Son, and God the ‘ Holy Spirit ; three properties, one Divinity.’

And at another place in the same oration ; ‘ The three are one in ‘ the Godhead [or essence], and the one three in properties [or ‘ persons] : that there may be neither one in the Sabellian sense ; ‘ nor three in that wicked sense now set up,’ viz. the Arian.

I desire the reader to compare the account of this oration or sermon, which he will conceive by these passages, with the account given by Mr. Le Clerc of the same oration : and if he doubt which is the truest, to read the oration itself, and some other of the same Father’s works ; and so pass his judgment. This may be sooner done, than to read the squabbles *pro* and *contra* about them. And indeed if people would choose to read the Fathers and ancient writers themselves, rather than scraps and quotations out of them ; it were the only way to defeat the purpose of those, that would defeat us of that strength and corroboration of the Christian religion, which accrues by the constant succession of its fundamental doctrines in all ages.

I will mention but one passage more of Gregory, and that out of his oration concerning baptism<sup>t</sup>, out of which I recited before what properly concerns baptism : but he there speaking of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in whose name they were to be baptized, explains their way of subsisting in the Godhead, so as any one will perceive he means a numerical unity of the essence. Always provided that we make allowance for this ; that they had not, as I said, any such settled use of words of a determinate meaning, *specifical*, *numerical*, &c., as we use now : but expressed their sense by paraphrasing as well as they could. But you will see that he means,

<sup>s</sup> [Orat. § 28.]

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. 40.

that though they are in some sense three, yet that their essence, or nature, is one, and that numerically one: not three natures or essences all alike, (as three men have,) but one in number. ‘They are each of them God as considered singly, viz. the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, each having his property: but the three together are God, when considered conjunctly. The first of which sayings is true, because of consubstantiality, the other because of the monarchy [or unity]. I no sooner go to think of one, but I am in my mind surrounded with the three shining round about me. I no sooner go to think distinctly of the three, but I am carried back to the unity [or to consider them as one]. When I am thinking of one of the three, I conceive him as the whole; and my mind has no room for any thing else: I find myself unable to comprehend the greatness of him, so as to leave any thing for the other. When I think of the three together, I see them as one lamp, whose compacted light cannot be divided or measured.’

XII. People’s meaning about a doctrine is never better perceived, than by observing in some dispute about it how, and with what reasons, one side attacks, and how the other answers. Let us therefore observe in some heresies that were about the doctrine of the Trinity, what arguments the sectaries used, and which way the churchmen answered. It will appear that the doctrine of the church was such an unity of essence in the Divine persons, as we call *numerical*.

I shall mention one heresy before the council of Nice, and one after it; because the pretence is for the time of that council, and for some time before and after it, that the Christians held the persons in the Trinity to be so many different beings, and to be one in essence no otherwise than ‘as three men have the same common nature among them.’ If this were true, then farewell Fathers, and the church of Christ for all that time. For this would never justify them from an imputation of tritheism. But the contrary, God be thanked, has been fully shewn, both by bishop Stillingfleet, as I said, and by many other learned men: and needs no shewing to any one that will read the books themselves.

I. The first notable heresy that rose about the doctrine of the Trinity, was that of Praxeas, against which Tertullian wrote the book we spoke of: and it was after his time carried on by Noetus

100. and Sabellius, from the year 200 to 260: after which  
(A. D. 200.) time the men of that sect were called Sabellians. They  
160.  
(A. D. 260.) held, that there is but one person in the Godhead, as I



said. And this they pretended not to be any new doctrine set up by them, (for they and all people at that time owned this for a certain rule, as it undoubtedly is; that ‘whatsoever is new in the ‘fundamentals of religion, is false,’) but they maintained stiffly that it was the very sense of the Christian church before them. Now I say, that these men could never have so far mistaken the church’s sense, as to assert one person in number; unless the general doctrine had owned that there is but one essence in number. For if the church had held, that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit had each a distinct numerical essence, as three men have; the Sabellians could never have run into that mistake of the church’s meaning, as to think it to be, that there is but one person, and consequently that the Father suffered; which they did, and were therefore called Patripassians. And on the other side, the church would have had no difficulty in answering the objections of the Sabellians; who argued, that since there is but one God, there can be but one person in the Godhead. For if the church had held, as before, that the three persons have only the same specific or common essence, and not the same numerical essence; it had been no more a mystery that the Son should take flesh, and the Father not; than it is that of three men, that have all the same common nature of man, one should do or suffer any thing, and the other not. And they could not have avoided answering so. Whereas, on the contrary, the Fathers find it a very operose and difficult thing to answer the objections of those men, (witness Tertullian’s book against Praxeas,) and do always fly to the incomprehensible nature of the Divine essence.

And when the Arian disputes arose, the catholics that maintained the clause of one substance were constantly by the Arians reproached with Sabellianism, i. e. of holding but one person in number: which could not have been, but that they explained themselves so as to shew that they meant but one substance in number. This was the first and main ground of Arius’ falling off from the church. For so Socrates relates the matter<sup>u</sup>.

220. ‘Alexander the bishop, sitting on a time with his (A. D. 320.) ‘presbyters and other clergy, discoursed something nicely ‘of the holy Trinity; how there is in the Trinity *μονὰς*, an unity ‘[or singularity]. But Arius, one of the presbyters of his church, ‘a man not unskilful in logical quirks, thinking that the bishop did ‘set up the doctrine of Sabellius, did himself, out of contention, set ‘up the directly opposite extreme to that of that Libyan.’

<sup>u</sup> Hist. lib. i. cap. 5.

230. And a little after that the council of Nice had inserted (A.D. 330.) into the creed that phrase, that the Son is *ὁμοούσιος*, 'coessential' [or of one substance] with the Father; the same historian tells how there were great contests about the import of that word. And he says, 'They that disliked that word, thought that the approvers of it did set up the opinion of Sabellius: and so called them blasphemers, as if they had gone about to take away *ὑπαρξιν* the subsistence [or distinct personality] of the Son of God. And they, on the contrary, that approved that term, reckoned that their opposers brought in polytheism [or several gods] x.' And Sozomen gives the very same account y.]

This plainly shews that the catholics, who owned the word *ὁμοούσιος*, explained themselves so as to mean one substance in number. For else the accusations ought to have run quite contrary: and not the deniers of that phrase, but the approvers of it, would have been accused of polytheism, or tritheism: as they are now by these men. But they were then upbraided with Sabellianism, the direct contrary extreme: and the defenders of the Nicene Creed against the Arians do take most pains in vindicating themselves from that imputation; which could have had no appearance, if they had not been understood to hold one substance in number.

This made them to be accused of 'taking away the subsistence [or distinct personality] of the Son of God;' because they teaching that there is in the Trinity but one substance in all, and the others extending what they said of *οὐσία*, 'substance,' to *ὑπαρξις*, 'subsistence,' concluded that they thereby made but 'one subsistence in all;' and so the Son could have none. Whereas if they had meant, as these late slanderers represent their meaning, 'three substances in number,' or any thing that would have amounted to what that reviler calls 'three consubstantial gods z;' they would have been so far from taking away his *ὑπαρξις*, that they had given him a distinct *οὐσία*, essence or divinity, and had made him a distinct God from God the Father.

225. If there were time to enter into any of the particulars (A.D. 325.) of the history of the men of that time, such as Eustathius, (A.D. 360.) Meletius, &c., and other chief defenders of the Nicene faith; that would plainly shew the falsehood of this accusation. For if this accusation were true, these men would have been by the Arians hated and deposed under any pretence sooner than that of

x Lib. i. cap. 23.

y Lib. ii. cap. 18, 19.

z Above at § 8. p. 423.

Sabellianism: which, as Socrates<sup>a</sup> and Theodoret<sup>b</sup> tells us, was the chief pretence against them.

2. Now to come to some later times, and the heresies then arising. We shall see how directly contrary to history that opinion is, that pretends that it was ‘after the fifth century that the doctrine ‘of one individual essence was received.’ For it places the beginning of the catholic religion in opposition to tritheism, just at the time when tritheism, in opposition to the true religion, was first of all vented. For Joannes Philoponus, in the sixth century, was the first man of all that owned the Son and Holy Spirit to be God, that  
 470. ever offered to deny ‘the doctrine of one individual  
 (A.D. 570.) essence’ in the Godhead, and to affirm that each person in the Trinity had his own essence or substance distinct, and so that there were three substances or natures in number as well as three persons.

The quotations concerning him, and concerning his being condemned for this doctrine, might be easily produced, being a piece of history so well known and uncontroverted. It is only to spare time (having too far digressed already) that I desire the reader to take the account of his heresy in the words of the learned Dr. Cave<sup>c</sup>, who giving a short account of him (as he does of all other writers) relates the ordinary history concerning him thus: ‘He vented ‘several doctrines contrary to the faith. Having taken for granted ‘from Aristotle’s philosophy, of which he had been a great student, ‘that *hypostasis* is the same with *natura*, he thence concluded that ‘there is but one nature in Christ: and rejected the council of ‘Chalcedon. And afterward, when the catholics objected to him ‘that there are in the Trinity three hypostases, and yet but one ‘nature; to get clear of that objection, he ventured to maintain that ‘there are three natures or substances in the Trinity: yet still positively denying that there are three Gods, or deities. He was for ‘this reason accounted, and is to this day accounted, the author and ‘ringleader of the sect of the tritheists.’

The Socinians themselves, when they think it for their purpose, do instance in the condemnation of this man; saying of an opinion which they would represent the same as this, that ‘it was condemned by the ancients in the person of Philoponus; and in the ‘middle ages, in the person and writings of abbot Joachim<sup>d</sup>,’ &c.

<sup>a</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 9. de Eustathio.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 31. de Meletio.

<sup>c</sup> Hist. Literaria, part i. verb. Joannes Philoponus.

<sup>d</sup> Considerations on the Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 12. [The tract here quoted was written against the explications by doctors Wallis, Sherlock,



And can there be any thing fouler than to impute to the ancients an opinion, which they condemned as soon as they heard it vented? Would they have condemned him for expressing that which was their own meaning?

All that has any appearance of truth in this accusation of the Fathers is this; first, that they being used to a style that is fitter for an honest plain man to signify his meaning, than for a logician to hold a dispute in, and yet being forced to speak much of the Trinity, do many times express themselves so, and use such comparisons, periphrases, &c., as a captious man may take his advantage of, if he will single out some particular places: and secondly, that their disputes being against Arians, Eunomians, &c., who not only denied the numerical unity, but even the specific unity or equality of essence in the Trinity, do sometimes use such arguments as prove a specific unity; not that that was all they would have; but to overthrow one error first. And on this head they sometimes use the instance of three men being *ὁμοούσιοι* ‘of one substance:’ such is that place of Gregory Nyssen which Curcellæus urges, and bishop Stillingfleet confesses to be the hardest place in all antiquity. But in such places their aim is to argue thus; if three men, though differing as three individuals, yet having all the same sort of essence, are in some sense styled ‘of one substance with one another;’ how much more may the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit be so styled, who do not differ as three men, but have an essence that is *ἀμνητος*, *ἀμέριστος*, ‘unparted, undistinguished;’ and that is *ἀχωρίστως καὶ ἀδιαίρετως*, ‘inseparably and indivisibly,’ one and the same in them all? They used these last words to express that which we now express by ‘numerically one;’ or ‘one in number.’ And they thought these words did it more effectually; because a thing may be one in number, (as there is but one world in number,) and yet not uncompounded, indivisible, &c. as God’s essence is. In a word, to say that they sometimes used the instances of a specific unity, is true: but to say that they pleaded for no more than that in the Trinity, is false.

XIII. These answers and defences are necessary only in the case of those Fathers, whose style is more loose and Asiatic, and so their words more capable of being perverted from their true meaning. But other Fathers, as St. Austin, St. Hierome, St. Ambrose, &c. who

South, Cudworth, and Mr. Hooker; it is addressed ‘to a person of quality,’ and printed in 1693. 4to. pp. 35. There is a *second* piece, by the same author, and bearing precisely the *same* title, but directed against the archbishop of Canter-

bury, the bishops of Worcester and Sarum, and some others, addressed ‘in a letter to H. H.’ and published in the following year, 1694; 4to. pp. 68. The similarity of the two titles has made it necessary to insert this note.]

lived at the same time, and held the same faith and communion, being brought up to some use of logic, have placed their words concerning the numerical unity, so as that no file or tooth can touch them. This bishop Stillingfleet has shewn of St. Austin: and it is proved incontestably by these words of his, lib. vii. *de Trinitate*<sup>e</sup>, c. 4. ‘If the word *essence* were a specific name common to the three, why might there not be said to be three essences; as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are three men, the word *man* being a specific name common to all men?’ And a little after; ‘Quia hoc illi est Deum esse, quod est esse, tam tres essentias quam tres Deos dici fas non est.’ ‘Since with him it is the same thing to be God, as it is to be; we must no more say three essences [or beings] than three Gods.’ St. Hierome cannot well speak more home than he does in the place I quoted on another occasion<sup>f</sup>, ‘If any one, by hypostasis meaning essence, does not confess that there is but one hypostasis in three persons, he is estranged from Christ.’ And St. Ambrose argues, ‘How can the unity of the Godhead admit of plurality, when plurality is of number, and the Divine nature admits not of numbers?’ There would be no end of repeating the sayings of these and other Fathers, that are full and home to this purpose.

XIV. What then can be done with these Fathers? They are pointblank against the Socinians; and they cannot be made tritheists, but must be owned to be Unitarians in respect of God’s essence. They must be blackened some other way. As for St. Hierome, he is proud, unconstant, &c., and the rest have other faults. What shall be said of St. Austin, whose piety, humility, and caution in writing has obtained a great repute? Set Mr. Le Clerc upon him: he will prove him to be ‘one that has promoted some two doctrines, which have taken away all goodness and justice both from God and men<sup>h</sup>,’ and will find a way to lay the odium of that tyranny with which the French king persecutes his protestant subjects, at his door. Upon what grounds? Because he held the doctrine of prædestination, an inextricable point, in which good men in all ages have differed: and because he was convinced by the unquiet and contentious humour of the Donatists and Circumcellions, and by the good effect which the emperor’s edicts afterward had upon them, that moderate penalties inflicted on turbulent schismatics are useful.

<sup>e</sup> [Augustini Opera, tom. viii. p. 853, tom. ii. p. 684.]  
860. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>f</sup> Ch. iii. sect. 10. § 1.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. iii. de Spiritu Sancto, c. 13. [Op.

<sup>h</sup> Supplement to Dr. Hammond’s Annotations, Preface.

It is not only the Christians at the time of the council of Nice, and near before or after it, that have incurred the displeasure of these men, by their branding the Paulianists in the manner I mentioned: it is all the ancients of whom we have any remains. Socrates<sup>i</sup> tells, how Sabinus, a writer of the Macedonian sect, (these were akin to the Paulianists,) found it for his purpose to cast dirt on the Fathers of the Nicene council, making them a pack of ignorant and silly men. Yet he left a handle whereby himself might be refuted: for he had acknowledged (as he durst not deny) that Eusebius was a man of great judgment and learning. Socrates, by producing Eusebius' testimony<sup>k</sup> in commendation of the rest, rebukes the falsehood of that slanderer. But these have taken a more effectual course: they have put them all into the indictment, not leaving us one by whose evidence we might retrieve the credit of the rest. The reason is; they can find never a Paulianist among them.

The apostles chose the best men they could find, to succeed them in the ministry: such as Timothy, Titus, Polycarp, &c. They also gave them this charge; *The things which ye have heard of us before many witnesses, the same commit ye to faithful men, who may be fit to teach others also*<sup>l</sup>. They knew how much it concerned the good of the church, and the credibility of the doctrine in future times, to have it handed down by faithful, prudent, and judicious men. We have all the reason in the world to believe (unless the contrary could be proved) that this charge was obeyed by their deputies; and that the succession was for the first ages generally carried on in good hands. This race of men would persuade us the contrary: for they spare not any that are left of those that were nigh the  
67. apostles. Take Irenæus for example. He received the (A. D. 167.) doctrine from Polycarp, who was chosen by St. John. He has left some books against the heresies that were then, and some other pieces. These were much valued by the men of the next ages. They call him the mauler of heresies and false doctrines, a skilful conveyer of the history and traditions of the church. We pick out of his works the completest catalogue by far of the books of the New Testament, of any that is so ancient. Yet in so large writings he has here and there (as it happens to a man) some sayings and sentences of small force or weight; some particular observations of little moment, some arguings weak, and some mistaken. These they cull out, would have us judge of the whole

<sup>i</sup> Lib. i. cap. 8.<sup>k</sup> De Vita Constantini, lib. iii. cap. 9.<sup>l</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 2.



garden by these flowers; that they may represent the man a silly and credulous fop, and his works not worth the pains of reading.

Next to the undervaluing the authority of the Scripture, there is no so mischievous way to undermine the Christian religion, as thus to vilify the ancient professors of it. For it is they that have handed down the Scripture, and the interpretation and confirmation thereof to us. It is from them that we know which books are canonical, or were truly the writings of such or such an apostle. One of the assurances that we have that the miracles recorded were really wrought, is, that they who lived so near the time that they might easily inquire, did believe, and were really convinced of the matter of fact. And the more injudicious they are represented to be, the weaker that argument is. Therefore though we know them to be but men, and liable to mistakes, yet it is an unnatural impiety to make it one's business to represent them worse than they are.

But as their credit has held now so many hundred years in all the Christian world, when all the books of those that have nibbled at them have been slighted and forgotten: so the attempts made by these men are too void of strength and truth, to give us any reason to fear that they should overthrow it. It is a poor piece of spite to set one's self to be revenged on the credit of men dead 1300 or 1500 years since, because their words will not be brought to favour some alteration of the Christian faith that we would set up. And it is also an impious thing to be so far in love with such an alteration, as to go about to build it upon the ruins of the credit of Christianity in general. For what an ill face does this put upon the Christian faith, to maintain that it has been conveyed down to us by a church made up of silly and credulous men, and such as believed there were three Gods.

XV. After I had finished this chapter, there came over another book from Holland, written by the same spiteful enemy of the Fathers, whose cavils against them I have been here answering: where he brings in St. Austin also among the tritheists. He could not have taken a more effectual course to hinder any body from believing his slanders of the other Fathers. He calls his book *Bibliothèque Choisie*, intending it for a continuation of his *Bibliothèque Universelle*. And himself he styles here John Phereponus, that is, 'One that takes a great deal of pains' (to do mischief).

First, he labours by all ways to vilify St. Austin, as one that was no such linguist as Phereponus is: 'He understood (he says, tom. i. p. 406.) neither Greek nor Hebrew. He was not fit to

‘expound the Scripture. His reasonings popular, such as might please the Numidians, and other Africans, who were of all nations the most ignorant and most corrupt.’ This he says, though he knew that St. Austin was, not only for his preachings, but writings, the most celebrated bishop, (as St. Hierome says,) not only in Africa, but in the whole world. But he says, (p. 407.) ‘The churchmen of this age were hardly any better in the other provinces of the Roman empire.’ The question, whether one that understands not Hebrew nor Greek (which yet is not altogether true of St. Austin) may not for all that be fit to expound the Scripture, we will let pass: but this is certain, that one that does not believe the divinity of our Saviour Christ, is not fit to write harmonies, annotations, or paraphrases on it, nor translations of it. And all that abhor that heresy will be careful how they read them.

He proceeds (p. 410.) to say, without any proof there given, ‘that St. Austin, as well as the other Fathers, has followed the doctrine of that time, which established a specific unity between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and a distinction of the numerical essence: so that, speaking properly, they believed three essences perfectly equal, and strictly united in will:’ (which very mention of three essences is what St. Austin spoke of with abhorrence in the words I quoted just now.) Then having mentioned a book written against himself by the abbot Faydit<sup>m</sup>, intitled; ‘A Defence of the Doctrine of the Fathers concerning the Trinity, against the Tropolatres and Socinians; or the two new Heresies of Steven Nye and John Le Clerc, Protestants:’ he answers that he ‘holds no heresy:’ he ‘does not approve of the tritheism of the Fathers,’ &c. And if it be said that the ‘Fathers were not tritheists,’ then he refers to the authors he uses to do; Petavius, Curcellæus, Cudworth, (as if they had not been answered,) and to the piece that I mentioned, [the Life of Gregory Nazianzen,] written by himself. Where does this man think the catholic church was at that time? For he not only makes the Fathers to be heretics, (and tritheists, which is indeed to be pagans,) but calls it also ‘the doctrine of that time.’

But to shew us from how envenomed a spirit all this rises; and how he employs himself; he tells us, (p. 409,) that ‘he has found a way to make a comedy of five acts, out of the stories of certain miracles done at Hippo, of which St. Austin speaks in his 322d sermon, and

<sup>m</sup> [See ‘Apologie du système des SS. Pères sur la Trinité, contre les Tropolatres et les Sociniens, ou les deux nouvelles hérésies d’Etienne Nye et Jean le Clerc, Protestans, réfutées dans la response de

l’abbé Faydit au livre du R. P. Hugo,’ &c. 12mo. à Nancy, 1702. S. Nye’s work is entitled, ‘The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity,’ &c. 8vo. London, 1701.]

‘the following.’ Now the things there related by St. Austin are (if not proper miracles in the modern sense of the word, yet) wonderful and gracious providences of God; which the word *miracula* well enough signifies, and which all pious men think themselves bound to lay to heart, and commemorate, though this man makes a mock of them. This advertisement he gives, to see, I suppose, whether this copy too will yield any money; and whether, as he has found booksellers<sup>n</sup> that would stand out at nothing, so he can find any players profane enough to act this his comedy. And if they be so inclined, it is pity but they should do it: that they may fill up the measure of their impiety; and that all Christian princes and states may follow the good examples of the French king in exterminating them, and of the king of Prussia in prohibiting his books.

XVI. Since the first edition of this book, Mr. Le Clerc does, in an encomium which he writes on Mr. Locke<sup>o</sup>, own, that he has seen bishop Stillingfleet’s ‘Vindication of the Trinity.’ And after having passed a very slighting and contemptuous censure on what the bishop has there, and in some other pieces, written against Mr. Locke’s notions, and on the other side, as much magnified his hero, (the solidity of his doctrine, the exactness of his thought, &c. whereas bishop Stillingfleet understood neither his adversary’s meaning, nor the matter itself, and was never used either to think or to speak with any great exactness. See the saucy arrogance of this critic:)—he pretends at last to be surprised to find there a confutation of Curcellæus’ proofs of the tritheism of the ancients. He had reason to be surprised, if he had not seen it before; because he had since the publication of it cast vile reproaches on all the ancient Christians on the credit of those proofs, which he might see here all overthrown.

What does he do upon this surprise? Does he pretend to shew by any particulars, that Curcellæus had not mistaken the sense of his own quotations, as the bishop pretended to shew that he had? Or, if he cannot do this, does he acknowledge his own slanders? Neither of these. But instead of vindicating those quotations from being wrested, he throws in one more of his own to them, which is more apparently wrested than any of them. It is out of St. Hilary *de Synodis*: ‘Which book,’ he says, ‘Mr. Stillingfleet had not read ‘very carefully, or else did not remember distinctly. For there is ‘hardly any book from which one may more plainly prove that the ‘orthodox of that time believed one God in species, [i. e. as to the

<sup>n</sup> [See above, p. 218.]

<sup>o</sup> Biblioth. Choisie, tom. vi. [p. 393.]



‘sort or kind of Gods,] but three in number.’ Is not this horrid? Three Gods in number? Did ever any Christian own this? Then he produces the passage.

It must be noted that St. Hilary there, in disputing against the Arians, does labour to shew that the term *ὁμοούσιος*, ‘of one substance,’ is the most clear and the most significative of the catholic meaning; but yet that the term *ὁμοιούσιος*, ‘of like substance,’ as also the term ‘of equal substance,’ may be borne with and admitted, as being capable of being explained in an orthodox sense, and as being so explained and used by many catholic writers: viz. that *in divinis*, likeness or equality, are all one with identity or sameness. Speaking thus, ‘Si ergo [pater] naturam neque aliam ‘neque dissimilem ei quem invisibiliter<sup>p</sup> [*ℓ. indivisibiliter*] generabat, dedit; non potest aliam dedisse nisi propriam. Ita similitudo ‘proprietas est, proprietas æqualitas estq,’ &c. ‘If then he [God ‘the Father] gave [or communicated] to him whom he without ‘any division begot, a nature which is not another nor unlike; it ‘must be so, that he gave him no other than his own. So likeness, ‘and sameness, [or ownness,] and equality, are all one.’ And then, a few words after, comes the passage at which Mr. Le Clerc carps; ‘Caret igitur, fratres, similitudo naturæ contumeliæ suspicione; ‘nec potest videri Filius idcirco in proprietate paternæ naturæ non ‘esse, quia similis est: cum similitudo nulla sit, nisi ex æqualitate ‘naturæ; æqualitas autem naturæ non potest esse, nisi una sit; una ‘vero non personæ unitate, sed GENERIS<sup>r</sup>.’ ‘So that there is no ‘need, brethren, that you should suspect this phrase, “likeness of ‘nature,” of any reproachful meaning: nor will the Son seem not ‘to have the Father’s own nature for that reason, because he is ‘said to be *like* him. Whereas there is no likeness but by equality ‘of nature, and equality of nature cannot [in this case, speaking of ‘divine nature] be, unless it be One. One, not by unity of person, ‘but of GENUS.’

Whereas Mr. Le Clerc observes here, that supposing the numerical unity of the divine essence, it is not proper to say, the nature of the Son is like or equal to that of the Father; it is true, if St. Hilary had not explained himself so, as by equality to mean identity. And whereas he observes that by the word *genus* St. Hilary shews his meaning to be of a generical or specifical unity only; this also would have some sense according to the ordinary use of the word *genus*. But St. Hilary had declared in that very book in what

<sup>p</sup> [The Benedictine edition reads here *impassibiliter*.]

q [S. Hilarius de Synodis, prope finem. [sect. 74. p. 1192. edit. Benedict.]    <sup>r</sup> [Sect. 76.]

sense he took the word: as at the beginning of the book, in these words; ‘but seeing I must often use the words, *essence* and *substance*, we must know what *essence* signifies: lest we should use ‘words, and not know the meaning. *Essence* is that which a thing ‘is,’ &c. ‘And it may be called *the essence*, or *nature*, or *genus*, or ‘*substance* of any thing.’——And a little after, ‘whereas therefore ‘we say, that *essence* does signify the *nature*, or *genus*, or *substance*,’ &c. And constantly afterward he uses those words as synonymous. And accordingly Erasmus, in the dedication of his edition of St. Hilary’s works, had said; ‘of the same *essence*, or, as St. Hilary ‘often speaks, of the same *genus* or *nature* with the Father, which ‘the Greeks express *ὁμοούσιον*. So that to say, *Unitate, non personæ, sed generis*, is to say, ‘not one person, but one substance:’ or as he himself expresses it in the page before, *Non persona Deus unus est, sed natura*. ‘God is not one in person, but in nature.’

So unfair and pedantic a thing it is to catch hold of some single phrase or expression, whereby to account for an author’s meaning through a whole book. The contrary appears by many passages in the book. Particularly by this. He as well as the other Fathers does often say, that he that should preach that the Son, as well as the Father, is unbegotten, and without any cause, fountain, origin, or principle, [which the Greeks express, *ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀναρχον*, *unbegotten* and *unoriginated*, or *self-originated*,] would inevitably make two Gods. Or, ‘that God is one by virtue of the innascibility:’ *auctoritate innascibilitatis Deus unus est*. Because though there are three persons, yet One only of them is the fountain and origin of the Deity. Or, as Tertullian expresses it, ‘they are all One, inasmuch ‘as all are of one, that is, as to unity of the substance.’ *Contra Praxeam*, cap. 2.

Now he that speaks thus, plainly denotes a numerical unity. For a specific unity might as well or better be conceived between three coordinate *ἀγέννητα καὶ ἀναρχα*: but a numerical unity cannot be conceived, without conceiving the Father as the fountain of the Deity.

## CHAP. VI.

*The Opinions of the Ancients concerning the future State of Infants, or other Persons, that happen to die unbaptized.*

I. THE account of their opinion in this matter will be best given in these particulars.

1. All the ancient Christians (without the exception of one man) do understand that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5. *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man* [it is in the original *ἐὰν μὴ τις, except a person, or except one*] *be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; of baptism.*

I had occasion in the First Part to bring a great many instances  
 40.  
 (A. D. 140.) of their sayings: where all that mention that text, from  
 300. Justin Martyr down to St. Austin, do so apply it: and  
 (A. D. 400.) many more might be brought. Neither did I ever see it  
 1430.  
 (A. D. 1530.) otherwise applied in any ancient writer. I believe Calvin  
 was the first that ever denied this place to mean baptism<sup>r</sup>. He  
 gives another interpretation, which he confesses to be new. This  
 man did indeed write many things in defence of infant-baptism.  
 But he has done ten times more prejudice to that cause, by with-  
 drawing (as far as in him lay) the strength of this text of Scripture,  
 (which the ancient Christians used as a chief ground of it,) by that  
 forced interpretation of his, than he has done good to it by all his  
 new hypotheses and arguments. What place of Scripture is more  
 fit to produce for the satisfaction of some plain and ordinary man,  
 (who perhaps is not capable of apprehending the force of the conse-  
 quences by which it is proved from other places,) that he ought to  
 have his child baptized, than this, (especially if it were translated  
 in English as it should be,) where our Saviour says, that no person  
 shall come to heaven without it? meaning at least in God's ordinary  
 way. It is true that Calvin does at other places determine this to  
 be so; as I shall shew presently at § 8. But his dictate is but a poor  
 amends for the loss of a text of Scripture. Since his time, those  
 parties of the protestants that have been the greatest admirers of  
 him, have followed him in leaving out this place from among their  
 proofs of infant-baptism, and diverting the sense of it another way:  
 which the antipædobaptists observing, have taken their advantage,  
 and do aim to shut off all the protestant pædobaptists from it. They  
 are apt now to face out any of them that makes any pretence to this

<sup>r</sup> Institution. lib. iv. cap. 16. § 25.



text, as going against the general sense of protestants. Mr. Stennet, in his late answer to Mr. Russen, (p. 73,) having said that the 'custom (of baptizing infants) seems to have taken its rise from a 'misinterpretation' (as he calls it,) 'of this text;' and having instanced in Chrysostom, Cyril, and Austin, as concluding from this place a necessity of baptism to salvation, (and he might have added to them all the ancient Christians that ever spoke of this matter as producing this text, though not this only;) he himself declares, that he takes Calvin's interpretation, of which he there gives a scheme, to be the truer, you may be sure. Immediately after which, that which only *seemed* before, he now terms to be certain. And he adds, 'those of the Romish church still build their infant-baptism 'on the same principle.' If that be true, then we may observe (by the way) that he takes afterward, chap. vi. a great deal of pains to no purpose, to prove that they pretend no Scripture ground at all, but only the authority of the church. 'But this principle,' he says, 'the protestants have justly abandoned.' If he mean the principle of an absolute impossibility of salvation for a child by mischance dying unbaptized, as raised from this text, it is true. But if he mean the principle of an impossibility of salvation to be had, according to God's ordinary rule and declaration, any other way than by baptism, I shall by and by shew, that not all the protestants, if any, have abandoned it. On the contrary, they, most of them, take this text in the sense that the Fathers did: only they judge, that in determining of the future state of an infant so dying, we are not to bind God to the means that he has bound us to; but may hope that for extraordinary cases and accidents he will make an allowance. As in the case of circumcision omitted, though the rule were as peremptory as this, *That soul shall be cut off*: yet where his providence made it impracticable (as in those continual travels in the wilderness, &c.) he did not execute the penalty: and yet in ordinary cases the rule stood firm.

But see what a triumph this antipædobaptist raises, upon the supposal that the protestants have abandoned this principle. 'And 'since,' says he, 'this foundation is by these last [the protestants] 'allowed to be insufficient to bear the weight of infant-baptism: it 'might be worth a further inquiry, whether this practice is founded 'on any solid foundation at all: and if those who appear first to 'have used it, proceeded on so great a mistake, whether this custom 'ought not to be discontinued, as well as the basis on which it was 'originally laid.'

The judicious Mr. Hooker saw betimes the inconvenience, as well

as groundlessness, of this new interpretation of Calvin's, which was then greedily embraced by Cartwright and others, that they might with better face deny any necessity of that private baptism, which had been ordered by the church in cases of extremity: and says on that account, 'I hold it for a most infallible rule in expositions of sacred Scripture, that where a literal construction will stand, the furthest from the letter is commonly the worst.——To hide the general consent of antiquity agreeing in the literal interpretation, they cunningly affirm, that *certain* have taken those words as meant of material water; when they know, that of all the ancients there is not one to be named that ever did otherwise either expound or allege the place, than as implying external baptism. Shall that which hath always received this, and no other construction, be now disguised with a toy of novelty?——God will have it [the sacrament] embraced not only as a sign or token what we receive; but also as an instrument or mean whereby we receive grace,' &c.—'If Christ himself, which giveth salvation, do require baptism, it is not for us that look for salvation, to sound and examine him, whether unbaptized men may be saved: but seriously to do that which is required, and religiously to fear the danger which may grow by the want thereof,' &c. Eccles. Polity, book v. § 59, 60.

2. By those words, *the kingdom of God*, in this text, they do all of them understand (as any one would naturally do) the kingdom of glory hereafter in heaven.

This is confessed by the right reverend author of the late Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, who goes about himself to affix another sense on those words, viz. that they here signify *the church*, or *the dispensation of the Messiah*. For speaking of the ancient times, he says<sup>s</sup>, 'the words of our Saviour to Nicodemus were expounded so as to import the absolute necessity of baptism in order to salvation: for it not being observed that the dispensation of the Messiah was meant by the kingdom of God, but it being taken to signify eternal glory, that expression of our Saviour's was understood to import this, that no man could be saved unless he were baptized;' &c.

It must be granted, that in some places of the New Testament, by these words, *the kingdom of God*, is meant the gospel-state in this life. I gave an instance before<sup>t</sup>, where I think it is so taken. But it is also often taken in the ordinary sense for the state of

<sup>s</sup> Bishop Burnet on the Articles, Art. 27.

<sup>t</sup> Part i. ch. 19. § 21.

future glory. And that it should be so taken here, I crave leave to offer these reasons.

1. All the ancient expositors and other Fathers, both Greek and Latin, do, as I said, understand it so. The reader has seen a multitude of their sayings occasionally here brought, whereof not one is capable to be understood otherwise: and I believe none can be produced that is. Hermas, who set down in writing these words of our Saviour, or the substance of them, before St. John himself did, takes it so: as appears by his speaking<sup>u</sup> of people entering this kingdom after their death. Tertullian<sup>x</sup> paraphrases, ‘cannot enter,’ by *non habet salutem*, ‘cannot be saved.’ And so all the rest. Now it is hard to think that not one of the ancients should expound it right.

2. Mr. Walker, who had consulted as much on the exposition of this text as any man, takes the antipædobaptists for the first inventors of the new exposition: and that it was invented by them to serve a turn. For so are his words<sup>y</sup>: ‘God’s spiritual kingdom ‘on earth, or the visible church, which is all that the anabaptists ‘will have these words to signify: and upon this design, because ‘they would by this distinction avoid the force of the argument ‘hence for infants’ baptism,’ &c.

3. As he there observes, this text explains itself: for the expression being redoubled by our Saviour in verse 3, and again in verse 5, it is in verse 3, *he cannot see the kingdom of God*. And St. Austin long ago made this observation<sup>z</sup>; ‘what he had said, *he cannot see*, he explained by saying, *he cannot enter into*.’ Now for the church here; one, that is not baptized, may see it. It is therefore plainly meant of the kingdom of glory.

4. It is not likely that our Saviour should, in his discourse with Nicodemus, introduce a sentence in so solemn a way of speaking, as to premise twice over to it these words: *Verily, verily, I say unto thee*: and yet at last the sentence should come to no more than this; that ‘without baptism one cannot be entered into the ‘church.’ For ‘to be baptized,’ and ‘to be entered into the ‘church,’ are terms much about equivalent.

Neither does it appear what the antipædobaptists gain by this interpretation of theirs, if it were consistent: since the only way, at least the only known and ordinary way, to the kingdom of glory,

<sup>u</sup> See part i. ch. 1. § 2.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. ch. iv. § 3.

<sup>y</sup> Modest Plea for Infants’ Baptism,

ch. xii. § 8.

<sup>z</sup> Lib. iii. de Anima et ejus origine, cap. 11. [tom. x. p. 382. edit. Benedict.]



is by being of Christ's church, or under the dispensation of the Messiah.

As for the 'absolute necessity of baptism to salvation,' which the learned bishop, whom I mentioned, says these words were anciently expounded to import: I am going presently to recite the sense of the ancients particularly, how far they expounded them so, and how far not.

St. Austin is of opinion<sup>a</sup> that had it not been for this sentence of our Saviour, the Pelagians, when they were so hard pressed with the arguments taken from the baptism of infants, 'would have determined that infants were not to be baptized at all.'

The church of England, together with the whole ancient church, does apply and make use of this text as a ground of baptizing infants: beginning the office for it thus; 'Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith, *None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost,*' &c. And afterward, 'Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate,' &c. And they do in all the three Offices of Baptism, as soon as the party is baptized, whether he be infant or one of riper years, give thanks that he is 'regenerated, and grafted into the body of Christ's church.'

And whereas some people have expressed a wonder at St. Austin, that he should hold 'that all that are baptized are also regenerate;' no man living can read him without perceiving that he uses the word *regenerate* as another word for *baptized*, and that this with him would have been an identical proposition; as if one should say nowadays, 'all that are baptized, are christened.'

If some of late days have put a new sense on the word *regenerate*, how can St. Austin help that? And the church of England uses the word in the old sense.

Many of the late defenders of infant-baptism have, as I said, left out this place from among the proofs that they bring from Scripture for it: but for what reason, it is hard to imagine.

If they fear that from hence will follow a ground of absolute despair for any new convert for himself, and for any parent in respect of his child, dying before he can be baptized: is it not natural to admit of the same *ἐπιτελεία* and allowance in these words, as we do, and must do, in many other rules of holy Scripture? namely, to understand them thus; that this is God's ordinary rule, or the ordinary condition of salvation: but that in extraordinary

<sup>a</sup> Lib. i. de Peccatorum Meritis, cap. 30.

cases, (where his providence cuts off all our opportunity of using it,) he has also extraordinary mercy to save without it. The ancients, as I shall shew, did hope, and even conclude so, in case of a convert believing: and many in the following ages, of an infant.

If the objection be, that it is not easy to conceive how an infant can be born or regenerate *of the Spirit*, (which is mentioned in the text, as well as *of water*,) since he is not capable of any operations of the Spirit on his will, &c. It is not only owned by all other Christians, that the Holy Spirit, besides his office of converting the heart, does seal and apply pardon of sin, and other promises of the covenant: but also by the antipædobaptists, that the Spirit of Christ is given or applied to infants. So says Mr. Danvers<sup>b</sup>, 'That they are capable of salvation by Christ's purchase, and the application of Christ's blood and Spirit to them; who doubts it? I am sure I never affirmed the contrary.' And Mr. Tombes; 'The grace of God electing them, putting them into Christ, uniting them to him by his Spirit<sup>c</sup>, &c.

The antipædobaptists do themselves make use of this place of Scripture against the Quakers and other antibaptists, (and that with good reason,) to prove the necessity of baptism. Some of them also, that can read no other than the English translation, will sometimes very unwarily urge it against the pædobaptists; and will observe that it is said, *Except a man be born*, &c. it is not said, *a child*: concluding from the word, that he that is so born must be a man grown. But these, you will say, are right English divines. This may be retorted on them: for the original is not *ἐὰν μὴ ἀνὴρ*, or, *ἐὰν μὴ ἄνθρωπος*; 'except a man:' but *ἐὰν μὴ τις*, 'except any one.' And so the text is understood by the ancients; and by all that can read the original.

It is a common thing with the antipædobaptists, when they are attacked with that argument, that women's receiving the communion is no more plainly expressed in Scripture, than infant-baptism, to answer by citing that text; *Δοκιμαζέτω ἑαυτὸν ἄνθρωπος*, &c. 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat,' &c. and to urge that the word *ἄνθρωπος* being of the common gender includes women as well as men. And they will frequently boast and say, 'Do but produce as good proof for baptizing infants as this text affords for women's receiving, and we will comply.' Nevertheless, it is not advisable for them to venture any more on this challenge than they can be content to lose. For the word *τις* used here, *ἐὰν*

<sup>b</sup> Answer to Appeal, p. 9.

<sup>c</sup> Examen. [of Marshall's sermon, part ii. sect. 10. p. 33. edit. 4to. 1645.

μὴ τις, does (much more naturally than the word ἄνθρωπος) signify any one, or any person, man, woman, or child. It is only an Anglicism to say, *Except a man*, instead of, *Except a person be born of water*, &c.

2. Though the ancients understood the foresaid text to mean baptism, and though the words are peremptory, yet they were of opinion that God Almighty did in some extraordinary cases, when baptism could not be had, dispense with his own law. And one case, which they all agreed to be exempted, was that of martyrs. If any one had such faith in Christ, as willingly to sacrifice his life for the testimony of his truth; they concluded that such a man, whether he had as yet been baptized or not, was received into the kingdom of heaven: For this they called *baptismum sanguinis*, ‘a being baptized in blood:’ referring to that of our Saviour, Matt. xx. 22, *Ye shall be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with.*

So Tertullian<sup>d</sup>, ‘We have also another baptism, (which as well as ‘the other can be used but once,) namely, that of blood.’ ‘Hic

<sup>100.</sup> ‘est baptismus qui lavacrum et non acceptum repræ-  
(A.D. 200.) sentat, et perditum reddit.’ ‘This is a baptism which  
‘will either supply the place of water-baptism to one that has  
<sup>150.</sup> ‘not received it, or will restore it to one that has  
(A.D. 250.) ‘lost [or defaced] it.’ The same thing is owned by  
<sup>250.</sup>  
(A.D. 350.) Cyprian<sup>e</sup>.

St. Cyril, who says thus; ‘If one be never so upright, and yet ‘do not receive the seal of water, he cannot enter into the kingdom ‘of heaven: this is a bold speech, but it is none of mine; it is ‘Jesus Christ that has made this decreef:’ yet afterward, in the same oration, excepts martyrs.

<sup>407.</sup> So likewise Fulgentius, as positive as he is, that none  
(A.D. 507.) can be saved without baptism, yet puts it, ‘Exceptis iis,  
‘qui pro Christi nomine suo sanguine baptizantur.’ ‘Except  
‘those who are for the name of Christ baptized in their own blood.’  
<sup>295.</sup> (A.D. 395.) <sup>296.</sup> (A.D. 396.) Gennadius speaks to the same  
purpose<sup>h</sup>.

And St. Austin says<sup>i</sup>, ‘Ever since the time that our Saviour said, *Except any one be born again of water*, &c. and at another place, *He*

<sup>d</sup> De Baptismo, cap. 16.

<sup>e</sup> Epist. 73. ad Jubaianum.

<sup>f</sup> Catech. 3.

<sup>g</sup> De Fide ad Petrum, cap. 30.

<sup>h</sup> De Eccles. Dogmatibus, cap. 74.

<sup>i</sup> Lib. i. de Anima, et ejus origine, cap. 9.



‘that shall lose his life for my sake shall find it; no person is made a member of Christ, but either by baptism in Christ, or by death for Christ.’

3. Beside the case of martyrs: if a heathen man was arrived to some degree of belief of the Christian religion, and confession of it, and yet died without baptism; they judged of his case with some distinction.

For if the man had shewn a contempt or gross neglect of baptism as a needless thing, and then were cut off by death without receiving it; they judged such a case to be hopeless.

<sup>100.</sup> (A. D. 200) Tertullian himself calls that a wicked doctrine, ‘to think that baptism is not necessary to those that have faith.’ His

<sup>274.</sup> words you have before, part i. ch. 4. § 3. And St. Ambrose<sup>k</sup> speaks of it as a received opinion, ‘that a catechumen, though he believe in the cross [or death] of the Lord Jesus, yet unless he be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, cannot receive remission of sins, nor be partaker of the gift of spiritual grace.’ He must mean, of those that refuse or contemn baptism, as will appear by what I shall quote from him by

<sup>260.</sup> and by. And Gregory Nazianzen, speaking of three sorts (A. D. 360.) of persons that die unbaptized, reckons these the worst, and likely to have the greatest punishment. His words are recited in part i. ch. 11. § 6. St. Austin’s words also I produced before, part i. ch. 15. sect. 4. § 3. ‘But when a man goes without it by his wilful neglect of it, he is involved in guilt: for that must not be called a conversion of the heart to God, when God’s sacrament is contemned.’ So that the learned Vossius, in his book of baptism, Disp. 6. Thes. 6. having spoken of some points of baptism in which the opinions of the Fathers differed, owns them to have been unanimous in this: ‘This is,’ says he, ‘the judgment of all antiquity, that they perish eternally who despise baptism, i. e. will not be baptized when they may.’

If it were one that intended to be baptized some time or other, but put it off from time to time, either out of a negligent delay, or out of a desire of enjoying unlawful lusts some time longer, and then happened finally to miss it; as St. Chrysostom says he had

<sup>260.</sup> known it happen too often: they judged such an one lost; (A. D. 360) though not liable to so great punishment as he that had absolutely despised it. So Gregory Nazianzen determines in the

<sup>k</sup> Lib. de his qui initiantur, c. 4. [sect. 20. Op. tom. ii. p. 330.]

place last mentioned; and their sayings to that purpose are too common to need repeating. I shall recite only one of Hermas for its antiquity, being writ in the apostles' time. He speaks<sup>1</sup> of a vision which he saw of the building of the church triumphant, under the emblem of a tower built with several stones: and he saw<sup>m</sup> many sorts of stones rejected and cast far from the tower. And among the rest, some 'cadentes secus aquam, nec posse volvi in 'aquam, volentibus quidem eis intrare in aquam:' 'that fell nigh 'the water, [on which the tower was built,] and though they 'seemed desirous to go into the water, could not roll into it.' And in the explication<sup>n</sup>, he asks, 'What are those other that fell nigh 'the water, and could not go into water?' Answer is made, 'They 'are such as heard the word, and had a mind to be baptized in 'the name of the Lord; but considering the great holiness which 'the truth requires, withdrew themselves, and walked again after 'their wicked desires.' And I think it very probable that St. James means this sort of men, ch. i. 6, 7, 8, where he speaks of some that were *double-minded, wavering, unstable, tossed to and fro* in their resolutions; and he says there, that *such shall receive nothing of the Lord.*

Some put off their baptism a long time, fearing lest after it they might fall into sin again. These Tertullian commends,<sup>100.</sup> (A.D. 200.) and advises to stay till the danger of lust is over: and says at one place<sup>o</sup>, that to such men, if they should happen to miss of baptism, 'an entire faith is secure of salvation.' But all the rest do much discommend this practice, as appears at large in the sermons made to the catechumens by St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory Nyssen, St. Chrysostom, and others.

Nazianzen says, this is the 'deceit of the Devil coun-<sup>260.</sup> (A.D. 360.) 'terfeiting holiness, and cheating men of the grace of 'baptism, by persuading them to an overcaution: that by means 'of their fear of staining their baptism they may altogether miss 'of it<sup>p</sup>.'

Nyssen says<sup>q</sup>, that of the two it is better to receive<sup>260.</sup> (A.D. 360.) it now, though one should fall into sin after, than to hazard the loss of it by this caution. For to those that sin afterward, he allows hopes of pardon upon repentance: but of those that die without being baptized at all, he says, 'When I hear that 'peremptory sentence, *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except one be*

<sup>1</sup> Pastor, lib. i. vision. 3.<sup>m</sup> Vis. 3. cap. 2.<sup>n</sup> Ibid. cap. 7.<sup>o</sup> See part i. ch. iv. § 5.<sup>p</sup> Or. 40.<sup>q</sup> Orat. adversus eos qui differunt baptismum.

‘*born again*, &c., I dare not forebode any good to those that are not initiated.’

380.  
(A. D. 480.) Chrysostom<sup>r</sup> brings in these men arguing; and answers them: “I am afraid;” says one. If you were afraid, you would receive baptism and preserve it. “But I therefore receive it not, because I am afraid.” But are you not afraid to die in this condition?—He that sins after baptism (as it is like he will, being but a man) will, if he repent, obtain mercy. But he that, making a sophistical use of the mercy of God, departs this life without the grace, will have inevitable punishment.’ And afterward, ‘In what anguish of mind, am I, think you, when I hear of any one that is dead that was not baptized, considering those unsufferable torments?’ And in another tract<sup>s</sup>, ‘If sudden death seize us, which God forbid, before we are baptized; though we have a thousand good qualities, there is nothing to be expected but hell.’

150.  
(A. D. 250.) Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who was of the same opinion as St. Cyprian was, that baptism given by heretics is null, asks (by way of objection to himself) this question<sup>t</sup>; what should be said of the case of those, who having come from the heretics to the church, and having been received without a new baptism, were since dead without it? He answers; ‘They are to be accounted in the same state as those that have been catechumens among us, and have died before they were baptized.’ But what he thought that state to be, cannot be plainly known, because the next words are very obscure: yet Rigaltius, by an amendment of the words, (without the authority of any manuscript,) makes them favourable for the case of such deceased persons: and bishop Fell<sup>u</sup> allows of his opinion.

If any of the foresaid sorts of men did put off their baptism till some dangerous sickness seized them, and then were baptized in their sick bed, and died: though they did give hopes that such a baptism was available to salvation, yet they counted these no creditable sort of Christians, because they seemed to come to it no otherwise but by mere constraint. Nay, Nyssen<sup>w</sup> reckons these among such as shall not be punished, but, on the other side, shall not go to heaven. There were ancient canons, that such, if they recovered,

<sup>r</sup> Hom. 1. in Acta Apost. [tom. ix. p. 11, 13. edit. Montf.]

<sup>s</sup> Hom. 24. in Joann. [tom. viii. p. 147.]

<sup>t</sup> Apud Cyprian. Epist. 75. prope finem.

<sup>u</sup> [See Cypriani Opera, edit. Fell. Oxon. 1682. part. ii. p. 226.]

<sup>w</sup> Orat. adversus eos qui Differunt Baptismum.



should never be admitted to holy orders; as appears by the epistles  
 150. of Cornelius recited by Eusebius<sup>x</sup>. Though it appear by  
 (A.D. 250.) the same that Novatian was dispensed with for this  
 incapacity.

But there is one case of a man's dying unbaptized, on which they generally put a favourable construction, though with some difference of opinion concerning his future state. And that is, if a man while he was in health were come to a steadfast resolution of being baptized the next opportunity, but were hindered by sudden death, or some other unavoidable impediment. Nazianzen's opinion of such is, that they shall not be punished; and yet neither, on the contrary, shall they be glorified. He, as well as Nyssen, and many other of the Greek church, seems to have thought that there is a middle state, not partaking, or not much, either of happiness or misery. You have his words, part i. ch. 11. § 6. He shewed also, by that anguish of soul which he himself felt when he was like to die without baptism<sup>y</sup>, that he feared either hell, or at least the loss of heaven.

St. Ambrose speaks at one place doubtfully of these men's escaping punishment, but more doubtfully of their obtaining any reward, in the words which I cited in part i. ch. 13. § 2. 'But suppose they do obtain a freedom from punishment, yet I question whether they shall have the crown of the kingdom.' But yet afterward he gives his opinion positively in the case of Valentinian, (who missed of baptism in the manner we now speak of,) that his desire of baptism was accepted instead of baptism, not only for pardon, but also for glorification: as was shewed in ch. iii. sect. 3. § 3.

St. Austin embraces this opinion of St. Ambrose last mentioned; and gives a proof of it out of Scripture from the example of the penitent thief: 'Which,' says he<sup>z</sup>, 'when I consider thoroughly, I find that not only martyrdom for the name of Christ may supply the want of baptism; but also faith and the conversion of the heart, in a case where by reason of the straitness of the time the sacrament of baptism cannot be celebrated. For that thief was not crucified for the name of Christ, but for his own ill deserts: neither did he suffer for his belief; but while he was suffering, he came to believe. So that in his case it appears how much that which the apostle says, *with the heart we believe unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation*, does avail

<sup>x</sup> Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. 43.

<sup>y</sup> See ch. iii. sect. 6. § 1.

<sup>z</sup> Contra Donatistas, lib. iv. cap. 22. [Op. tom. ix. p. 139. edit. Benedict.]

‘without the visible sacrament of baptism. But it is then fulfilled invisibly, when not the contempt of religion, but some sudden exigent of necessity, keeps one from baptism.’

Since this thief had a promise of paradise, it is plain that St. Austin means, that a man dying in that case may have hopes, not only of impunity, but of reward. Besides that he thought there is no middle place.

In his *Retractations*<sup>a</sup>, he considers this matter over again; and says, the example of the thief is not absolutely fit for this purpose, ‘because one is not sure whether he were baptized or not,’ i. e. some time in his life before, which is very improbable. Yet he insists on the probability of it in his writings against Vincentius Victor<sup>b</sup>.

IV. One might have thought, that they should have as good hopes of the state of an infant dying unbaptized, as of a heathen convert, who believed, and sincerely desired baptism, dying likewise unbaptized: since it may be said of the infant, as well as of the other, that it is not his fault, but mischance, that he is not baptized. And Nazianzen and the others that do allot a middle state to the one, do allot the same to the other. But St. Austin, and those who allow of no state absolutely middle, have hopes of the convert’s (such as the thief was) going to heaven, though unbaptized; but no hopes of an unbaptized infant’s escaping some degree of condemnation.

The reason of the difference, as they seem to understand it, is, that whereas God ordinarily requires both faith and baptism, yet that either of them (when the other cannot be had) may suffice to salvation. As the thief having no baptism, but having faith and the desire of baptism, was saved: and infants, having not faith, but having baptism, are saved: but infants dying unbaptized, having neither faith nor baptism, cannot escape some degree of condemnation for original sin.

To this purpose are St. Austin’s words<sup>c</sup>; ‘as in the case of the thief, who by necessity went without baptism corporally, salvation was obtained, because he spiritually was partaker of it by his godly desire: so where that [baptism] is had, salvation is likewise obtained, though the party go without [that] faith which the  
1015. ‘thief had.’ And so likewise St. Bernard<sup>d</sup> resolves the  
(A. D. 1115.) case from St. Austin. Having said that a man having

<sup>a</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 18. [Op. tom. i. p. 48.]

<sup>b</sup> [See above, part i. ch. 20. sect. 2. &c.]

<sup>c</sup> De Baptismo contra Donatistas, lib.

iv. cap. 23. [Op. tom. ix. p. 140.]

<sup>d</sup> Epist. 77. ad Hugonem de Sancto Victore. [Op. tom. ii. p. 98, &c. edit. fol. Paris. 1586.]

faith, and the desire of baptism, may be saved though he miss of baptism, he adds; ‘infants indeed, since by reason of their age ‘they cannot have faith, nor the conversion of the heart to God, ‘consequently can have no salvation if they die without baptism.’

The ancients had not all of them the same opinion concerning the death that is brought on mankind by original sin. The author  
 254. of that Comment which has been ascribed to St. Ambrose, (A.D. 354.) but has since been thought to be Hilary the deacon’s, and by others to be mixed out of several ancient works, thinks it to be only temporal death. The words that are two or three lines before those I am going to recite, are for certain Hilary’s, (for St. Austin quotes them under his name<sup>c</sup>.) The words to this purpose are these, Comment in Rom. v. Having spoken of the death which St. Paul says came on all by Adam’s sin, he adds; ‘There is ‘also another death, which is called the second death in hell, which ‘we do not suffer for the sin of Adam: but by occasion thereof it ‘is brought on us by our own sins.’ It is plain this man would not have sentenced infants to the second death in hell. But the more common opinion, I think, especially in the western parts, was, that the death threatened to Adam, and coming by original sin on all by  
 260 nature, is eternal death. Pacianus teaches so in his (A.D. 360.) Sermon of Baptism<sup>f</sup>: ‘Mind, O beloved, in what death a ‘man is before he be baptized. You know that received point, ‘that Adam was the head of our earthly origin: whose condemna- ‘tion brought on him subjection to eternal death, and on all his ‘posterity, who were all under one law.’

Accordingly they differed concerning the future state of infants dying unbaptized: but all agreed that they missed of heaven.

Those of the Greek church do generally incline to the opinion of that middle state. Their words are cited in the first part: viz. Nazianzen’s, ch. xi. § 6. Those of the author of the questions in Justin Martyr, ch. xxiii. § 3. And those of the author of the *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, ibid. The opinion of Pelagius, (who conversed most in the Greek church,) ch. xix. *passim*. The words of St. Ambrose (who transcribed most that he wrote from Greek authors), ch. xiii. § 2.

But St. Austin, and most of the Latin church in his time, holding no such middle state, do believe such infants under some degree of condemnation: whose words you have in the fifteenth, nineteenth,

<sup>c</sup> Lib. iv. ad Bonifac. cap. 4. [Sect. 7. Op. tom. x. p. 472.]

<sup>f</sup> [See this in the Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. iv. p. 246. edit. Colon. 1618.]



and twentieth chapters. Both one and the other agree in this, that infants dying unbaptized cannot come to the kingdom of heaven.

How hard soever this opinion may seem, it is the constant opinion of the ancients: none ever having maintained the contrary

<sup>319.</sup> in these times, nor a great while after, except that Vincentius Victor mentioned in the twentieth chapter of the First Part, who also quickly recanted. St. Austin, in a letter to St. Hieromeg, says, 'Whoever should affirm that infants which die ' without partaking of this sacrament shall be quickened in Christ, ' would both go against the apostles' preaching, and also would ' condemn the whole church: *universam ecclesiam.*' And of the Pelagians, who, believing no original sin, had therefore the most favourable opinion of any that was then held, of the natural state of infants, he says; 'that even they, being awed by the authority ' of the Gospel, or rather *Christianorum populorum concordissima* ' *fidei conspiratione perfracti*, being overswayed by the agreeing ' consent in the faith of all Christian people, *sine ulla recusatione* ' *concedunt quod nullus parvulus, nisi, &c.*, do without any tergiver- ' sation own, that no infant that is not born again of water and of ' the Spirit, does enter into the kingdom of God<sup>h</sup>.'

Tertullian himself, who at one place advises to keep children unbaptized till the age of reason, is thought by the pædobaptists, and confessed by some of the other side, to mean 'when there is no ' danger of death before:' because he owns it for a standing rule, that 'without baptism there is no salvation for any person<sup>i</sup>.'

And Nazianzen, who advises to defer their baptism till they are three years old or thereabouts, expresses himself with this limitation, 'if there be no danger of death.' And if there be any danger, advises it to be given out of hand, as a thing without which they will, he says, 'not be glorified<sup>k</sup>.' And except these two, none speak of any delay of it at all.

V. But that party that believed no middle state, and thought that the Scripture obliges us to confess that infants are under some degree of condemnation, and that they are *by nature children of that wrath* mentioned Eph. ii. 3; yet believed that it is a very moderate and mild punishment which they shall suffer, if they die unbaptized. This I speak of the times of our period of the first four centuries: for afterward the opinion grew more rigid, as we shall see.

<sup>g</sup> Epist. 28. [166. in edit. Benedict.]

<sup>i</sup> See part i. ch. 4. § 3.

<sup>h</sup> Epist. 105. ad Sixtum, prope finem.  
[cap. 7. sect. 52. Epist. 194. ed. Benedict.]

<sup>k</sup> See part i. ch. 11. § 6.

St. Austin does very often assert this mild degree of their condemnation; because the Pelagians did not fail to represent the doctrine of original sin odious, upon the account of such infants as missed of baptism, sometimes not by their parents' fault, but by some unavoidable accident. He thinks it necessary to maintain against these men the doctrine itself, though it be severe: but he takes care not to represent it more severe than he thought the plain words of Scripture enforced. Therefore as in one place of his book<sup>1</sup>, *De Peccatorum Meritis*, he says, 'Let us not therefore of our own head promise any eternal salvation to infants without the baptism of Christ, which the holy Scripture, that is to be preferred to all human wit, does not promise.' So in another chapter of that book he has these words:

'It may well be said, that infants departing this life without baptism will be under the mildest condemnation of all. But he that affirms that they will not be under condemnation, does much deceive us, and is deceived himself: when, as the apostle says, *Judgment came on all men to condemnation*<sup>m</sup>,' &c. To the same purpose he speaks in his *Enchiridion*, cap. 93.

In another book of his it appears how mild he thought this condemnation might be: even so mild, that to be in that state might be better than to have no being at all. For Julian the Pelagian had objected, that if the doctrine of original sin were true, it were a cruel and wicked thing to beget children; who would be born in a state of condemnation, and consequently in such a state as that it were to be wished they had never been born: citing that of our Saviour, *Well were it for that man that he had never been born*. To this St. Austin answers<sup>n</sup>, that God is the author of being to all men; many of whom, as Julian must confess, will be eternally condemned: and yet God is not to be accused of cruelty for creating them. And further, that all godly parents will take all care possible for baptizing their children, which will take off that original guilt, and make them heirs of a glorious kingdom. And as to those infants that yet die unbaptized, answers thus:

'I do not say, that infants dying without the baptism of Christ will be punished with so great pain, as that it were better for them not to have been born: since our Lord spoke this, not of all sinners, but of the most profligate and impious ones. For if in the day of judgment some shall be punished in a more tolerable degree than others; as he said of the men of Sodom, and would

<sup>1</sup> Cap. 23.<sup>m</sup> Cap. 15.<sup>n</sup> Lib. v. contra Julianum, cap. 11. [Sect. 44. Op. tom. x. p. 650. edit. Benedict.]

'be understood not of them only: who can doubt, but that infants unbaptized, who have only original sin, and are not loaded with any sins of their own, will be in the gentlest condemnation of all? Which as I am not able to define what or how great it will be; so I dare not say that it would be better for them not to be at all, than to be in that state.

'And you yourselves, who contend that they are free from all condemnation, are not willing to consider to what condemnation you make them subject, when you separate from the life of God and the kingdom of God so many images of God: and also when you separate them from their pious parents, whom you expressly encourage to the begetting of them. If they have no original sin, it is unjust that they should suffer so much as that: or if they suffer that justly, then they have original sin.'

He shews that the future state in which the Pelagians thought such infants would be, is not so different from that in which he judged they would be, as they did invidiously represent. For they confessed that without baptism they could not come to the kingdom of God, but must eternally be separated from God and from their parents: but they would not call this condemnation. He judged that they were under condemnation, but so gentle, that probably that state would be better than no being at all; and consequently, that they or their parents would have no reason to wish that they had never been born.

St. Austin does so generally observe this rule of speaking with great caution and tenderness of the degree of their condemnation; that when Erasmus came to revise his works, he quickly found that the *de fide ad Petrum* was none of his<sup>o</sup>; for this reason among  
 410. others, because the author (who is since known to be Ful-  
 (A.D. 510.) gentius) does express the condemnation of infants that die unbaptized in such rigid terms, as that 'whether they die in their mother's womb, or after they are born', one must hold for certain and undoubted, that they are *ignis aeterni supplicio sempiterno puniendi*, to be tormented with the everlasting punishment of eternal fire; and again<sup>a</sup>, *interminabilia gehennæ sustinere supplicia: ubi Diabolus*, &c. 'to suffer the endless torments of hell; where the Devil with his angels is to burn for evermore. This,' says Erasmus, 'I never read any where else in St. Austin; though he does frequently use the words *punishment, condemnation, perishing*.'

<sup>o</sup> Erasmi Censura ad istum librum.  
 [See this, among the supposititious pieces,  
 in the Appendix to tom. vi. p. 19, &c. of

the Benedictine edition]

<sup>p</sup> Cap. 27.

<sup>q</sup> Cap. 3. [sect. 36.]



Erasmus' observation is true for the general. Yet it must be confessed, that in one sermon<sup>r</sup> of his, where he is eagerly declaiming against the Pelagians, who taught that infants were baptized not for eternal life but for the kingdom of heaven, and that if they die unbaptized they will miss of the kingdom of heaven indeed, but have eternal life in some other good place; he confutes their opinion thus: 'Our Lord will come to judge the quick and the dead: and he will make two sides, the right and the left. To those on the left hand he will say, *Depart into everlasting fire, &c.* To those on the right, *Come, receive the kingdom, &c.* He calls one *the kingdom*; the other, *condemnation with the Devil*. There is no middle place left where you can put infants.'—And afterward; 'Thus I have explained to you what is *the kingdom*, and what *everlasting fire*: so that when you confess the infant will not be in *the kingdom*, you must acknowledge he will be in *everlasting fire*.'

But these words came from him in the midst of a declamatory dispute. He would, if he had been to explain himself, have said, as in other places, that this fire would be to them the most moderate of all. Though he speak of this matter one or two thousand times, yet he never, as I know of, mentions the word *eternal fire* in their case but here. So that we must either conclude that the heat of controversy carried him in that extempore sermon beyond his usual thought; or else we must conclude, by Erasmus' rule, that that sermon is none of his.

It was the foresaid book of Fulgentius, (which asserts this dogmatically, and over and over,) being commonly joined with his works, and taken for his, that fixed on him in after-ages the title of *Durus infantum pater*: 'The father that is so hard to infants.' It

<sup>410.</sup> was Fulgentius, that lived one hundred years after, and (A.D. 510.) not he, that most deserved that name.

Whereas Grotius observes<sup>s</sup>, that St. Austin never expressed any thing at all of their condemnation, not even to those lesser pains, till after he had been heated by the Pelagian disputes; seeming to intimate that he was not of that opinion before; but took it up then in opposition to the Pelagians: I have shewed before<sup>t</sup> what St. Austin himself says to that imputation; for it was objected by some in his lifetime.

VI. I shall here make a short excursion beyond my limits of four

<sup>r</sup> De verbis Apostoli, Sermon. 14. [294. edit. Benedict. Op. tom. v. p. 1185.]

<sup>s</sup> Annot. in Matth. cap. xix. 14.

<sup>t</sup> Part i. ch. 15. sect. 3. § 2.

hundred years: and see how the opinions of men did come to some abatement of this rigour after the time of Fulgentius, who  
 433.  
 (A.D. 533.) died anno 533.

500.  
 (A.D. 600.) In pope Gregory's time, anno Dom. 600, the opinion of their being tormented continued. For he speaks thus<sup>u</sup>:  
 'Some are taken from this present life before they come to have  
 ' any good or ill deserts by their own deeds: and having not the  
 ' sacrament of salvation for their deliverance from original sin,  
 ' though they have done nothing of their own here, yet there they  
 ' come *ad tormenta*, to torments.' And a little after; *perpetua tormenta percipiunt*, 'they undergo eternal torments.'

The same, or at least the opinion of moderate torments, continued  
 290.  
 (A.D. 390.) down to Anselm's time: for he speaks thus on that subject<sup>x</sup>;—'Though all shall not be equally tormented  
 ' in hell. For after the day of judgment, there will be no angel or  
 ' human person, but what will be either in the kingdom of God  
 ' or else in hell. So then the sin of infants is less than the sin  
 ' of Adam: and yet none can be saved without that universal satisfaction, by which sin, be it great or small, is to be  
 ' forgiven.'

Thus far it continued. But about this time the doctrine of the church of Rome and the western world took a great turn in this point: and they came over to the opinion of the Greek doctors that

1050.  
 (A.D. 1150.) I mentioned. For Peter Lombard, anno Dom. 1150, determines<sup>y</sup>, that the proper punishment of original sin (where there is no actual sin added to it) is *pœna damni, non pœna sensus*, 'The punishment of loss, (viz. loss of heaven and the sight  
 ' of God,) but not the punishment of sense, viz. of positive torment.'

1100.  
 (A.D. 1200.) Pope Innocent the third confirms this, by determining<sup>z</sup> that the 'punishment of original sin is *carentia visionis Dei*, being deprived of the sight of God: and of actual sin the  
 ' punishment to be *gehennæ perpetuæ cruciatus*, the torments of an  
 ' everlasting hell.'

Then Alexander de Ales<sup>a</sup> and Aquinas<sup>b</sup>, and so the whole troop  
 1130.  
 (A.D. 1230.) of schoolmen, do establish the same by their determination.  
 1155.  
 (A.D. 1255.) They suppose there is a place or state of hell or hades, which they call *limbus*, or *infernus puerorum*, where un-

<sup>u</sup> Lib. ix. Exposit. Moral. in Job. cap. 16. [c. 21. tom. i. p. 303. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>x</sup> Lib. de conceptione Virginis et peccato originali, cap. 22.

<sup>y</sup> Lib. 2. Sentent. Distinct. 33.

<sup>z</sup> Decret. lib. 3. cap. de Baptismo, can. *Majores*.

<sup>a</sup> Summa, part. 2. Quæst. 122. membr. 10.

<sup>b</sup> Parte tertia, Quæst. i. Art. 4.

baptized infants will be in no other torment or condemnation but the loss of heaven.

But they did not know what to do with that authority of the book *de Fide ad Petrum* which I mentioned, and which they took to be St. Austin's, which says; 'We must believe most firmly, and 'make no question of it, that they are tormented with eternal fire.' Yet see the power of distinctions. Alexander de Ales answers<sup>c</sup>, 'To be punished with that fire may be understood two ways: 'either on account of the heat of it, or of the darkness of it. They 'that have actual sins will be punished with the heat: but the 'other, only with the darkness of it, as wanting the sight of God,' &c. Now darkness without heat is, one would think, but improperly expressed by *fire*. But he says, (and true enough,) 'that if we do 'not understand it so, it will be contrary to what St. Austin says at 'other places of the mildness of their punishment.'

This was, as I said, the general opinion of the schoolmen. Yet Gregorius Ariminensis<sup>d</sup> (who is called the tormenter of children)  
 1260. and Driedo<sup>e</sup>, endeavoured to revive the opinion of Ful-  
 (A. D. 1360.) gentius: but found no followers, after that the other opinion had been countenanced. The doctrine of eternal torments finds a difficulty in sinking into men's belief, (if they have considered what eternity is,) when it is applied to the case of wicked men. Much more in the case of infants, who have in their own person not known or committed good or evil, and have only the stain of nature. And our Saviour, speaking of grown men, says, *They shall be beaten with few stripes, if they be ignorant persons, and such as knew not their master's will*. How much more must that rule hold in the case of infants, who never were capable of any sense at all about it!

Dr. Field, in his book of the church<sup>f</sup>, is pleased to call this opinion of the schools a Pelagian conceit. But I have proved that it is elder, especially in the Greek church, than Pelagius; and was held by those that acknowledged original corruption: which corruption, they confessed, carried with it, in unbaptized persons, condemnation. But they thought the loss of heaven for ever was that condemnation; and that when there was no actual sin in the case, there would no positive punishment, or a very gentle one, be

<sup>c</sup> Loco citato.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. 2. Distinct. 31. Quæst. 3. [See Gregorius de Arimino in primo et secundo sententiarum, fol. Venetiis 1503. part. ii. fol. 104, &c.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. i. de gratia et libero arbitrio,

tract. 3. [See Joannis Driedonis a Turnhout Opera, tom. iii. fol. 69, &c. fol. Lovanii 1552—1556. The author was professor of divinity in the university of Louvain.]

<sup>f</sup> Lib. iii. Appendix.



added. They thought that that alone made a mighty difference between infants baptized, and those that die unbaptized; that the one should enter into the kingdom of heaven, the other eternally miss of it: according to that sentence of our Saviour before mentioned, John iii. 5.

This opinion of no positive punishment, or a very gentle one, was afterward so general, that when the contrary one was anew set up by the protestants, it was by some adjudged to be heresy. For Father Paul, in giving an account how the council of Trent<sup>s</sup> prepared their decrees about original sin, (which were determined in <sup>1446.</sup> the fifth session, June 17, 1546,) mentions their disputes (A. D. 1546.) among themselves, whether they should condemn as heretical that proposition of the Lutherans, ‘that the punishment for ‘original sin is hell fire:’ and says it missed very narrowly being anathematized: it was only out of respect to St. Austin and Gregorius Ariminensis that they forbore. The good Fathers doubtless mistook, as well as other men, Fulgentius’ book for St. Austin’s, so that the blow had in great measure missed him: but by what I produced before out of pope Gregory the first, ‘They shall undergo ‘eternal torments;’ it appears that they were nigh doing a greater mischief. There wanted but an ace but they had branded one of the most renowned bishops of the infallible see for a heretic. A shot that would have recoiled on themselves.

VII. All mentioned hitherto have taken for granted that there is no hope of such infants entering the kingdom of heaven: only they differ about their positive punishment, or the degree of it. But some others have conceived hopes of their obtaining that also in one case: which is, when the parents, being good Christians, do in heart and purpose dedicate their child to God, and pray for it, and do their best endeavour to get it baptized; but are prevented by its sudden death.

I have taken some pains (more perhaps than such a particular thing deserves) to find who was the first that ventured to declare this charitable opinion, after it had been so decried by the ancients, and recanted by Vincentius. I find none elder than Hincmarus arch-

<sup>760.</sup> bishop of Rhemes, anno Dom. 860, who expressed such (A. D. 860.) hopes; but it was in a case that was very particular. A certain rash and stubborn bishop in his province, named Hincmarus too, bishop of Laudun, had excommunicated all his clergy, so that there was nobody to give baptism, absolution, or burial. The arch-

<sup>s</sup> History of the Council of Trent, book ii. [page 167, 168. edit. Brent. London, fol. 1676.]

bishop writes a severe reproof to him<sup>b</sup>, and in it takes occasion to speak of the fate of such infants as had in the meantime died without baptism; hoping that they by God's extraordinary mercy might be saved, though he had done what lay in him for their perishing. He argues thus; 'As in the case of infants that are 'under the guilt of the sin of nature, that is, the sins of others; the 'faith of others, that is, of their godfathers that answer for them in 'baptism, is a means of their salvation: so also to those infants to 'whom you have caused baptism to be denied, the faith and godly 'desire of their parents or godfathers, who in sincerity desired baptism for them, but obtained it not; may be a help (or profit) by 'the gift of him whose Spirit (which gives regeneration) breathes 'where it pleases.' I have occasion to mention this Hincmarus of Laudun again in the next chapter, § 1, because Danvers, reading somewhere that his metropolitan reproved him for suffering infants to die unbaptized, concluded that he was doubtless a bishop for his turn.

1155. Then for the case of an infant dying in the womb, the (A.D. 1255.) schoolmen before mentioned, Alex. de Ales and Aquinas, do say<sup>i</sup>, that 'such an infant being subject to no action of man, but 'of God only; he may have ways of saving it for aught we know.' They extend this no further than to the case of a stillborn infant: though the reason seems much the same for one that dies before he can possibly be baptized.

Vossius brings in St. Bernardi, Petrus Blesensis, Hugo de Sancto Victore, and even St. Austin himself, as asserting a possibility of salvation, and the kingdom of heaven, without baptism: and he seems to understand this their assertion to extend to the case of infants. But the places of St. Austin and Bernard are no other than those I recited at § 4 of this chapter: which do expressly exclude infants, and speak only of grown men, whose actual faith and desire of baptism makes amends for the want of it where it cannot be had. And the places in the other two, Blesensis and Hugo, do, if one examine them, speak to no other purpose.

The next therefore that I know of, that has any favourable opinion, or rather suspends all opinion, of the case of such infants, is our Wickliffe: whose words are these<sup>k</sup>; 'When an infant

<sup>h</sup> Opusculum 55. capitulorum, cap. 48.

<sup>i</sup> Part. iii. Quæst. 68. Art. 11.

<sup>j</sup> De Baptismo, Disp. 7. Thesi. 22, 23.

[Op. tom. vi. p. 281.]

<sup>k</sup> Trialog. lib. iv. cap. 11. [See Joannis

Wiclefi Dialogorum libri quatuor, 4<sup>o</sup>. sine loco, 1525. fol. 118, 119.—This rare piece was reprinted (according to Brunet) at Frankfurt in 1753, and at Bareuth in 1754.]

‘ of believers is brought to church, that according to Christ’s  
 ‘ rule he may be baptized ; and the water or some other requisite  
 ‘ is wanting ; and the people’s pious intention continuing, he dies  
 ‘ in the meantime naturally by the will of God : it seems hard to  
 ‘ define positively the damnation of such an infant ; when neither  
 ‘ the infant nor the people have sinned, that he should be damned.  
 ‘ Where then is the merciful liberality of Christ ?’ &c.

Then he discourses some things preparatory to his answer, too large to repeat here : but his answer is this ; chap. xii. ‘ And by  
 ‘ this, I answer your third objection, granting that God, if he will,  
 ‘ may damn such an infant, and do him no wrong ; and if he will,  
 ‘ he can save him : and I dare not define either part. Nor am I  
 ‘ careful about reputation, or getting evidence in the case ; but as a  
 ‘ dumb man am silent, humbly confessing my ignorance, using con-  
 ‘ ditional words : because it is not clear to me whether such an  
 ‘ infant shall be saved or damned. But I know that whatever God  
 ‘ does in it will be just, and a work of mercy to be praised of all  
 ‘ the faithful.’ Then he calls them presumptuous that of their own  
 authority define any thing in this case. He counts it rash to  
 determine their damnation : and, on the other side, says, ‘ he that  
 ‘ says, “ that in this case put, an infant shall be saved, as is pious to  
 ‘ believe,” puts himself more than needs, or will profit him, upon an  
 ‘ uncertainty.’ In the next chapter he handles the degree of their  
 punishment in case they be damned : and he determines it contrary  
 to the schools, that it will be not only loss of heaven, but sensible  
 punishment.

It is to be noted, that he had spoke his mind before of the state  
 of infants that are baptized, as being out of danger. For in  
 chap. xii, having discoursed of three sorts of baptism ; viz. of water,  
 of blood, and of the Spirit ; and that the third is the chief ; and  
 that God, for aught we know, may sometimes grant that without  
 the other : he adds, ‘ *Reputamus tamen absque dubietate, quod*  
 ‘ *infantes recte baptizati flumine, sint baptizati tertio baptis-  
 ‘ cum habent gratiam baptismalem.*’ ‘ But we hold that to be with-  
 ‘ out doubt, that infants that are rightly baptized with water, are  
 ‘ baptized with the third baptism, [viz. that of the Spirit,] when as  
 ‘ [or seeing that] they have the baptismal grace.’

This last I note, because Mr. Danvers<sup>1</sup> had brought this man for  
 one of his witnesses against infant-baptism ; taking a great deal of  
 pains to shew how great a man Wickliffe was. And what is worse,

<sup>1</sup> Treatise of Baptism, part ii. ch. 7. p. 280. edit. 2.



he had cited some passages out of this book, and these very chapters; taking here and there a scrap, which by itself might seem to make for his purpose.

Mr. Baxter<sup>m</sup>, to answer him and vindicate Wickliffe, transcribed the whole passage of the length of several pages. A thing that is tedious, but yet necessary in answering such quoters. 'And now 'reader judge,' says Mr. Baxter, 'what a sad case poor, honest, 'ignorant Christians are in, that must have their souls seduced, 'troubled, and led into separations,' &c. by such a man,——when a man as 'pleading for Christ and baptism dare, not only print such 'things, but stand to them in a second edition, and defend them by 'a second book.'

But all this did no good upon him. For that he might shew himself the most tenacious man that ever lived, of what he had once said, he does in another reply<sup>n</sup> after that, go about with a great many words to maintain his point.

I shall be so civil to my reader as to take for granted that the words of Wickliffe here given, though but a small part of those produced by Mr. Baxter, do satisfy him: for if an author give his opinion in plain words, that all baptized infants are in a state of salvation; but make a question of those that die unbaptized, whether they can be saved or not; and do also speak of the baptizing of an infant as being *according to Christ's rule*, and do call the people's intention of doing it *a pious intention*: one needs no plainer account of his approving it. If Wickliffe had ever spoke a word against the baptizing of infants, the council

<sup>1315.</sup> of Constance would not have failed in those forty-five (A.D. 1415.) articles drawn up against him, after his death, to have objected that; for they commonly overdo that work: whereas they object nothing about baptism; and what others object is, that he gave hopes that some unbaptized infants might come to heaven.

The same thing appears in the tenets of Wickliffe's scholars that survived him. For Foxe, in his Martyrology<sup>o</sup>, recites out of the register of the church of Hereford, a declaration of faith made by one Walter Brute, a scholar of Wickliffe, examined before the bishop of

<sup>1293.</sup> Hereford, anno Dom. 1393, in which he says, 'I greatly (A.D. 1393.) 'marvel at that saying in the decrees which is ascribed 'to Austin, that little children that are not baptized shall be tor- 'mented with eternal fire, although they were born of faithful

<sup>m</sup> More Proofs, part iii. p. 353. <sup>n</sup> [See Danvers' Second Reply, 8<sup>o</sup>. 1675. p. 120, &c.]  
<sup>o</sup> Second edition, vol. i. p. 453.

' parents, who wished them with all their hearts to have been baptized.——How shall the infant be damned that is born of faithful parents that do not despise, but rather desire to have their  
 1305. ' children baptized?' &c. And afterward, in the time (A.D. 1405.) of Henry IV, one of the articles usually enjoined for the Lollards, who were the disciples of Wickliffe, to recant, was, as Foxe recites it, this; ' that an infant, though he die unbaptized, shall be saved.' But there is no such thing in Foxe, as Danvers<sup>a</sup> would prove out of a book he calls Dutch Martyrology, that one Clifford informed the archbishop, that a Lollard, if he had a child new-born, would not have him baptized. Foxe does indeed tell<sup>r</sup>

1328. how a good while after, in the time of Henry VI, some (A.D. 1428.) Lollards of Norfolk had, among other articles, this objected to them; that they held or taught, ' that Christian people be sufficiently baptized in the blood of Christ, and need no water: and that infants be sufficiently baptized if their parents be baptized before them: and that the sacrament of baptism used in the church by water is but a light matter and of small effect.' But he shews at the same place, that in all probability both this and several other of the articles charged on them, were by the informers altered in words from what they had said, on purpose to make them odious: which was the constant vein of the popish accusers of those times. Wickliffe had said, that the water itself, without the baptism of the Spirit, is of little efficacy. And he and his followers had said, that if the parents be good Christians, and pray for their child, there is hope that it may be saved, though it do by some sudden chance die before it can be baptized. And if these men said no more than so, yet that was enough for their adversaries to frame such a slanderous information. But if we suppose that they did really hold what was objected, then they were not of the antipædobaptist opinion, (as Danvers by altering the words something the other way, would represent<sup>s</sup>;) but of the humour of the Quakers, to slight all water-baptism.

1350. The Hussites also in Bohemia had the same hopeful opinion (A.D. 1450.) viz. that infants dying unbaptized may be saved by the merey of God, accepting their parents' faithful desire of baptizing them for the deed: as appears by their history, both in Foxe<sup>t</sup> and the writers from whom he copies. And this was objected to them as an error by the papists there, as it was to the Lollards

<sup>p</sup> Second edition, vol. i. p. 485.

<sup>a</sup> Treatise, part ii. ch. 7. [p. 303.]

<sup>r</sup> Foxe, as above, p. 608.

<sup>s</sup> Treatise, part ii. ch. 7. [page 304.]

<sup>t</sup> At the year 1415.

here. Indeed they were disciples of our Wickliffe as well as the  
 1395. Lollards. For John Huss, the first reformer there, imbibed  
 (A.D. 1495.) the sense of religion which he had from Wickliffe's books;  
 and took this principle among the rest.

Nay, even in the church of Rome some doctors have shewn a  
 great inclination to this opinion, and have expressed it as far as  
 they durst. Cassander quotes Gerson, Biel, Cajetan, and some  
 others, as expressing some hopes in this case, and encouraging the  
 parents of such children to pray for them. But I doubt that Ger-  
 son and Biel do mean only such infants as die in the womb: which  
 amounts to no more than what the old schoolmen had said, as I  
 shewed. Yet Gerson's words are ambiguous: I will set them down.

1315. He had been observing<sup>u</sup> that God does not always tack  
 (A.D. 1415.) his mercy to the sacraments: and thereupon advises 'wo-  
 ' men great with child, and their husbands, to use their prayers for  
 ' their infant that is not yet born, that (if it be to die before it can  
 ' come to the grace of baptism with water) the Lord Jesus would  
 ' vouchsafe to sanctify it beforehand with the baptism of his holy  
 ' Spirit. For who knows but that God may perhaps hear them?  
 ' Nay, who would not devoutly hope, that he will not despise the  
 ' prayer of his humble servants that trust in him? This considera-  
 ' tion is useful to raise devotion in the parents, and to ease their  
 ' trouble of mind, if the child die without baptism; forasmuch as  
 ' all hope is not taken away. But yet there is, I confess, no cer-  
 ' tainty without a revelation.'

This is part of a sermon preached before the council of Con-  
 stance, where Huss was condemned and martyred. And one error  
 whereof Huss was accused was, that he held the salvation of infants  
 that by mischance die unbaptized. Therefore if Gerson means this  
 of children born alive, it shews that he was of another temper than  
 the rest of that bloody popish council.

1425. Cardinal Cajetan was another of the better sort of pa-  
 (A.D. 1525.) pists; and he<sup>x</sup> ventures to say of children that die after  
 they are born, and yet before they can be baptized, that 'it is not  
 ' unreasonable to say, that baptism in the desire of the parents is  
 ' in such case of necessity sufficient for their salvation:' but says, he  
 speaks 'under correction.' And he has been corrected. For some doc-  
 tors have called him an heretic<sup>y</sup> for this: others, that are not so severe,

<sup>u</sup> Serm. de Nativitate Mariæ Virginis,  
 Consid. 2. [Op. tom. iii. p. 1350, edit.  
 1706.]

<sup>x</sup> In tertiam partem Thomæ, Quæst. 68.

Art. 1, et 2.

<sup>y</sup> Vasquez in tertiam partem Thomæ,  
 tom. 2. Disp. 141. cap. 3.



yet say it is an erroneous and rash opinion to think this to be possible.

<sup>1339.</sup> Indeed the council of Florence had determined, that ‘ the  
(A.D. 1439) ‘ souls of all that die in actual mortal sin, or even in ori-  
‘ ginal sin alone, do go *ad infernum*, to hell.’ I suppose they mean  
that infants go to that part of hell which they call *limbus puerorum*,  
where there are no torments.

<sup>1470.</sup> But above all, Cassander himself has shewn a very com-  
(A.D. 1570.) passionate temper, in the pains he has taken to encourage  
parents to some hopes, and to earnest prayers for their child so  
dying<sup>z</sup>. But withal a very modest one, when he adds these words ;  
‘ This opinion of mine concerning infants, I will not defend with  
‘ contention or obstinacy : nor rashly condemn those, who being  
‘ persuaded by the authority of the ancients, and of almost the  
‘ whole church, do allow salvation to those infants only, to whom  
‘ God, in his secret but just judgment, does vouchsafe the sacra-  
‘ ment of regeneration and baptism.’

VIII. Upon the reformation, the protestants generally have  
defined that the due punishment of original sin is, in strictness,  
damnation in hell. I suppose and hope that they mean with St.  
Austin, a very moderate degree of it in the case of infants, in  
whom original corruption, which is the *fomes* or source of all  
wickedness, has not broke out into any actual sin.

But if their doctrine has in this respect been more rigid than  
that of the church of Rome, or of the ancient Greek doctors ; they  
have in another respect, viz. in the case of Christian people’s chil-  
dren, given such a mitigating explication of our Saviour’s words,  
as to allow better hopes than either of them. For they do generally  
incline to think, that if a child by misfortune die before it can  
have baptism, the parents’ sincere intention of giving it, and their  
prayers, will be accepted with God for the deed ; and will be  
available to procure of God’s mercy pardon of original sin, and even  
an entrance into the kingdom. Whereas the schoolmen and Fathers  
have thought that Christ at the day of judgment will proceed by that  
sentence, John iii. 3, 5, (such an one *cannot enter into the kingdom  
of God*,) in the manner that a judge in a court of common law  
proceeds upon the words of a statute, having no power to make  
allowance for circumstances : the protestants do hope that he will  
act in the manner that a judge of a court of equity does, who has  
power to mitigate the letter of the law in cases where reason would  
have it. The Fathers themselves thought this allowance would be  
made in the case of a grown man, who had a personal desire of

<sup>z</sup> De Baptismo Infantium. [Op. p. 778. edit. Paris. 1616.]

baptism: and that if it was an invincible necessity that kept him from water, he might *enter the kingdom* without being *born of water*. The protestants think the same in the case of the desire of the parent for his infant. They think thus; the main thing in God's intention in this case is, that a parent, as he dedicates himself to God, so he should likewise dedicate his child, and get him entered into that covenant made in Christ, without which there is no hope of heaven: and that he should accordingly make use of that symbol or outward sign which God has appointed to be the way of admission into that covenant, if he can possible: and that his refusal to do the latter will be looked on as a refusal of the covenant itself. But that if, notwithstanding his sincere desire and endeavour of obtaining the outward symbol, he be by some accident disappointed of it; God will yet grant the same favour that he had promised upon the use of it: because it is the heart that God regards; and where that is ready, outward things are accepted *according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not*: especially if some act of God himself, as the sudden death of the infant, &c. do render it impossible for him to have them.

Luther and his followers do indeed speak more doubtfully of this: and do lay so much stress on actual baptism, as that they allow a layman to do the office in times of necessity, rather than that the infants should die without it.

But Calvin, and those that follow him, (who to the great prejudice of religion made a needless schism from the others, or else the others from them, I know not which,) sunk the doctrine of the necessity of baptism a pitch lower. They own<sup>a</sup> that baptism is necessary not only *necessitate præcepti*, by God's command, but also thus far, *necessitate mediæ*, that it is God's ordinary means to regenerate and give salvation. But they determine it as a thing certain, that the child of a godly believing parent shall obtain the kingdom of heaven, though he do by sudden death, &c. miss of baptism: 'provided this happen by no negligence or contumacy of the parent.' And they deny that there is or can be any such necessity as to justify a layman's giving it. And Calvin takes an occasion to jeer some papists<sup>b</sup> that had said that 'if a child be like to die, and

<sup>a</sup> Calvini Antidotum ad acta Synodi Tridentinæ, sess. 7. Canon. 5. item Antidotum ad Articulos Parisienses, Art. 1. item Institut. lib. iv. cap. 15. § 22. [The first of these pieces was printed in 12mo, in the year 1547: and the second in 1542: (both editions are excessively rare:) they are found in the seventh volume of the

large collection of his works, *Genevæ*, 1617, &c. and in vol. viii. of that published at Antwerp in 1671.]

<sup>b</sup> [The words of the Theological Faculty of Paris are, 'Ventilatur ardua quæstio inter Doctores, utrum infans in periculo mortis, si non adsit aqua, debeat potius projici in puteum quam commen-

‘no water to be had but what is in the bottom of a deep well, and  
 ‘nothing to draw with; the best way is to throw the child down  
 ‘into the well, that it may be washed before it be dead.’

The church of England have declared their sense of the necessity, by reciting that saying of our Saviour, John iii. 5, both in the office of baptism of infants, and also in that for those of riper years. And in the latter they add these words; ‘Beloved, ye hear in this  
 ‘Gospel the express words of our Saviour Christ, that, *Except a man  
 ‘be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of  
 ‘God.* Whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament, where it may be had.’ And archbishop Laud, shewing that infant-baptism is proved from Scripture, and not from the tradition of the church only, (against the Jesuit, his adversary, who, to cast in a bone of contention, had asserted the latter,) gives his sense of it thus; ‘That baptism is necessary to the salvation of infants  
 ‘(in the ordinary way of the church, without binding God to the  
 ‘use and means of that sacrament, to which he hath bound us) is  
 ‘express in St. John iii, *Except, &c.*’

Concerning the everlasting state of an infant that by misfortune dies unbaptized, the church of England has determined nothing, (it were fit that all churches would leave such things to God,) save that they forbid the ordinary office for burial to be used for such an one: for that were to determine the point, and acknowledge him for a Christian brother. And though the most noted men in the said church from time to time, since the reformation of it to this time, have expressed their hopes that God will accept the purpose of the parent for the deed; yet they have done it modestly, and much as Wickliffe did, rather not determining the negative, than absolutely determining the positive, that such a child shall enter into the kingdom of heaven. Archbishop Laud’s words, we see, are; ‘We are  
 ‘not to bind God, though he hath bound us.’ And archbishop Whitgift, disputing with Cartwright, says, ‘I do mislike as much  
 ‘as you the opinion of those that think infants to be condemned  
 ‘which are not baptized<sup>d</sup>.’ All this is modest. But there are indeed some, that do make a pish at any one that is not confident, or does speak with any reserve about that matter; and they despise him and his scruples as much, and with as much success, as Vincenius the talkative did those of St. Austin on the same point<sup>e</sup>.

‘dari Deo cum expectatione eventus.  
 ‘Hoc autem esset homicidium dignum  
 ‘morte, nisi diceretur quod baptisma sit  
 ‘de necessitate salutis.’

<sup>c</sup> Relation of the Conference between  
 Archbishop Laud and Mr. Fisher, § xv.

numb. 4.

<sup>d</sup> Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, tract 9. chap. 5. Divis. 2. [p. 516. edit. Lond. 1574.]

<sup>e</sup> See part i. ch. 20.



For the opinion of the English presbyterians, I shall content myself with citing these words of Mr. Baxter: ‘I have hereby been made thankful that God has kept me from the snare of anabaptistry. For though I lay not so much as some do on the mere outward act or water of baptism, believing that our heart-consent and dedication qualifyeth infants for a covenant-right before actual baptism, (which yet is Christ’s regular solemnization and investiture,) yet I make a great matter of the main controversy: notwithstanding that I hereticate not the anabaptists for the bare opinion’s sake, nor would have them persecuted<sup>f</sup>,’ &c.

The antipædobaptists, as they allow no advantage to an infant by its baptism, nor yet by its being the child of a godly and religious parent; so they do not all agree about the state of infants dying before actual sin. One sort of them determine with great assurance, that all infants, of heathens as well as Christians, of the wicked as well as of the godly, shall be saved, and shall enter into the kingdom of God. And they dissuade men from having their children baptized, or *born again of water*, &c., seeing by this determination they are secure of heaven without it. To which the other commonly answer, that they desire such a safety for their children, as has some ground in God’s word, and not in their determination only: since an infant has no promise, right, or expectation of the kingdom of heaven, merely as it is a human creature, or born of human race; but only as being entered and interested in the covenant of Christ, by which is promised an eternal life after this; and the said covenant does require, as a condition of all that are to enter into the kingdom, that they *be born again of water*, &c.

Another sort of antipædobaptists have not this assurance concerning all infants, but do suppose a different state of them on account of the decrees of election and reprobation.

IX. Concerning the state of a baptized infant dying before actual sin, the whole Christian world has agreed that it is undoubtedly saved, and will be admitted to the joys of heaven: since it has all that the church of Christ can give it. St. Austin says, as I shewed before, ‘He that does not believe this is an infidel.’ And, ‘God forbid that we should doubt of it.’ It is certain, there was never any doubt made of it till the times of the late managers of the doctrine of prædestination. Some of these have added several limitations and provisoes to this proposition, relating to the election or sanctification of the parents, or their right to church member-

<sup>f</sup> Reply to Hutchinson, p. 39. [i. e. Baxter’s Review of the state of Christians’

Infants, &c. 8vo. London, 1676.]  
 § Part i. ch. 15. sect. 5. § 6.

ship: and some of them have used such expressions, as that they seem to think that even among the infants of faithful parents, some are so reprobated by the eternal decree of God, that though they be baptized, and die in infancy, yet they will be damned. Some sayings of Paræus, Perkins, Zanchius, &c. are by their adversaries produced to this purpose<sup>h</sup>. And it is known what exceptions<sup>i</sup> some have taken at the rubric of the last edition of the English liturgy at the end of the office of baptism; that ‘it is ‘certain by God’s word that children which are baptized, dying ‘before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.’

What enemies soever that assertion may have now, it had none in those times of which I am writing. The maintainers of prædestination in those days spoke thus of the case of an infant dying before actual sin; that if he was baptized before he died, it was thence manifest that he had been elected: if not, it appeared that he was not elected. Or thus; that those infants which were prædestinated to salvation, came by God’s providence to obtain baptism: but the others missed of it.

This is plain in the discourses of St. Austin, Prosper, Fulgentius, &c. ‘There are,’ says St. Austin<sup>k</sup>, ‘two infants born: if you ask ‘what merit they have; they both are of the lump of perdition. ‘But how comes it that the mother of the one brings him to the ‘grace (viz. of baptism); the mother of the other in her sleep ‘overlies it? You will ask me, What merit had one, that he should ‘be brought to the grace? What merit had the other, that was ‘overlaid by his sleeping mother? Neither of them deserved any ‘good. But *the potter has power over his clay, of the same lump to ‘make one vessel to honour, another to dishonour.*’

And he puts a harder case yet. The Pelagians, who held that the grace of God is given according to men’s merits, were urged by St. Austin to tell what foregoing merit one infant that was baptized and then died, could have above another that died without the grace of baptism. ‘If you should say,’ says he<sup>l</sup>, ‘that he merited this by ‘the piety of his parents: you will be answered, Why then do the ‘children of godly parents sometimes miss of this benefit, and the

<sup>h</sup> See Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dor-  
dracena Ministrorum Remonstrantium,  
&c. in scriptis dogmaticis, p. 45, 46.

<sup>i</sup> [See ‘an Account of all the proceed-  
ings of the Commissioners of both persua-  
sions appointed by His Sacred Majesty,  
for the review of the Book of Common  
Prayer,’ &c. 4to. London, 1661. Particularly  
p. 25, (signature E) or p. 27. (sign. E 2)

of another edition of the same date: also  
p. 118, of ‘the Papers that passed be-  
tween the Commissioners,’ &c. *ibid.*]

<sup>k</sup> Serm. de verbis Apost. xi. [Sermo  
xxvi. cap. 12. sect. 13. in edit. Benedict.  
Op. tom. v. p. 141.]

<sup>l</sup> Lib. ii. contra duas Epistolas Pela-  
gianorum, cap. 6. [Op. tom. x.]

‘ children of wicked parents obtain it? Sometimes a child born of  
 ‘ religious parents is taken away as soon as it is born, before it be  
 ‘ washed with the laver of regeneration: and an infant born of the  
 ‘ enemies of Christ is, by the compassion of some Christian, bap-  
 ‘ tized in Christ. A baptized and chaste mother bewails her own  
 ‘ son dying unbaptized; and yet, finding another child left in the  
 ‘ street by some strumpet, takes it up and procures it to be bap-  
 ‘ tized. Here for certain the merits of the parents can have no  
 ‘ place,’ &c. He goes on to shew by several other reasons or in-  
 stances, that it was impossible to assign any other ground of  
 difference, except the free purpose of God, ‘ why some infants  
 ‘ being baptized should obtain, and others dying unbaptized should  
 ‘ miss of, so excellent a benefit of being made the sons of God,  
 ‘ without any merit of their parents or of their own.’

<sup>340.</sup> So Prosper (or be it Hilarius, or pope Leo, that was the  
 (A.D. 440.) author of the book) *de Vocatione Gentium*, lib. i. c. 7,  
 challenges those who attributed the difference that God makes in  
 calling one nation or one person to the means of salvation, and not  
 another, to the different use that they had made of freewill, to give  
 any tolerable account of the case of infants; ‘ why some being  
 ‘ regenerated, are saved; others not being regenerated, do perish.’  
 —‘ For I suppose,’ says he, ‘ that these patrons of freewill will  
 ‘ not be so shameless, as either to say that this difference happens  
 ‘ by chance; or to deny, that those that are not regenerated do  
 ‘ perish.’

<sup>320.</sup> And those who were at that time (from the year 420 to  
 (A.D. 420.) 500) the opposite party in the church, to those that held  
<sup>400.</sup>  
 (A.D. 500.) this absolute election and reprobation, and were called by  
 the others semipelagians, as in reference to the adult they main-  
 tained that God had elected those who he foresaw would be faith-  
 ful; so for infants that die in infancy, they said; that those of  
 them which God foresaw would have been godly if they had lived,  
 those he in his Providence took care should be baptized: and those  
 that would have been wicked if they had lived, he by some provi-  
 dence causes to miss of baptism. So that both these contrary  
 parties agreed in this; that of infants so dying, all the baptized  
 ones were saved: and (as the opinion then was) all the unbaptized  
 missed of it.

Of the modern prædestinarians or Calvinists, if some have been  
 so rigid as to think that some baptized infants dying in infancy do  
 perish; yet they are not all of that opinion. Vossius allows it to  
 be an infallible rule which is expressed in the rubric aforesaid. ‘ It



‘is,’ says hem, ‘not the judgment of charity only, but of charity that cannot be mistaken, that we account baptized infants go to heaven, as many of them as die before the use of reason, and before they have defiled themselves with actual sins.’

X. From the last quoted place of St. Austin, one may observe, that the ancients did not, in the baptizing of children, go by that rule which some presbyterians would establish, viz. that none are to be baptized but the children of parents actually godly and religious. For he speaks of the case of a strumpet’s child, or a child ‘born of the enemies of Christ,’ viz. of heathens, found in the streets and baptized, as a common instance. And in his epistle to Auxilius<sup>n</sup>, a young bishop that had rashly excommunicated a whole family for the parents’ crimes, he desires him to shew a reason if he can, how a son, a wife, a slave, can justly be excommunicated for the fault of the father, husband, master. And then adds; ‘Or any one in that family that is not yet born, but may be born during the excommunication: so that he cannot, if in danger of death, be relieved by the laver of regeneration?’

Bishop Stillingfleet has fully shewn<sup>o</sup> the absurdity and inconsistency of this opinion of such presbyterians; and how they can never in many cases that may be put, come to a resolution or agreement what children may be baptized, and what not: and has cleared the grounds of baptism from such scruples. And as for the text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, on which they build those scruples, I have shewn<sup>p</sup> that the ancients do understand it in a sense much more plain and natural, and more agreeable to the scope of St. Paul’s arguing there, which gives no foundation for any such scruple. And we see by the instances here brought, and many other, that they willingly baptized any infants, if the parents, or any other that were owners or possessors of such infants, shewed so much faith in Christ as to desire baptism for them.

<sup>m</sup> De Baptismo, Disput. iv. Thes. iv.

<sup>n</sup> Epist. 75. [Ep. 250, sect. 2. in edit. Benedict.]

<sup>o</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, part iii. sect. 36.

<sup>p</sup> Part i. ch. 19. § 19. item, ch. 11. § 11.

## CHAP. VII.

*An account of the state of this practice from the year 400 till the rise of the German antipædobaptists. Of the Waldenses, and their chief accusers, St. Bernard, Petrus Cluniacensis, Reinerius, Pilichdorf, &c. The Confessions of the Waldenses themselves.*

I. I GAVE before<sup>q</sup> a note of reference to the books of some authors that lived after the year 400, for the use of those that would trace this practice for one century further. The general account of them is, that they speak of infant-baptism as a thing uncontroverted. And so it holds for all the following times till after the year 1000. The antipædobaptists who do put in their plea for the first 300 or 400 years, yet do (so many of them I mean as have any tolerable degree of learning and ingenuity) confess, that in all these following ages the baptizing of infants did prevail. Mr. Tombes says<sup>r</sup>, ‘The authority of Augustine was it which carried the baptism of infants in the following ages, almost without control.’ And though it appear plainly by St. Austin’s writings, which I have largely produced, that there was no Christian in the world that he knew or heard of, that denied it, (except those that denied all-baptism,) so that he need not say, ‘St. Augustine’s authority carried it:’ yet it is however a confession of the matter of fact for the after-times.

Only whereas he puts in the word ‘almost;’ as if some, though few, did oppose it: there is, on the contrary, not one saying, quotation, or example, that makes against it, produced or pretended, but what has been clearly shewn to be a mistake. As in the first 400 years there is none but one, Tertullian, who advised it to be deferred till the age of reason; and one, Nazianzen, till three years of age, in case of no danger of death: so in the following 600 there is no account or report of any one man that opposed it at all.

Some places of authors have been cited indeed: but there wants nothing but looking into the books themselves to see that they are nothing to the purpose. So Mr. Danvers created to Mr. Wills and Mr. Baxter a great deal of trouble, in sending them from one book to another to discover his mistakes and misrepresentations of several authors within this space: but withal a great deal of discredit to himself; for there is not one of his quotations, that seemed material enough to need searching, but proved to be such. Mr. Wills had

<sup>q</sup> Part i. ch. 22.

<sup>r</sup> Examen, part i. § 8. p. 12.

at first yielded him two authors as being on his side: but Mr. Baxter coming after, (and Mr. Wills himself upon a second review,) rectified that erroneous concession; as was easy to do by consulting the original authors, for it was taking the scraps and breviates of things out of the Magdeburgensian epitomizers, which occasioned that there was any possibility of mistake.

760. One of the two I spoke of was Hinemarus, bishop of (A.D. 860.) Laudun, whom I had occasion to mention in the last chapter<sup>s</sup> on another account. He had upon a quarrel<sup>t</sup> excommunicated all the clergy of his diocese, so that there was for a time none to baptize, bury, absolve, &c. Some children died by that means without baptism: complaint was made to his metropolitan: he reproves him, shews him the pernicious consequences, hopes that the children that died, and others that died without absolution, the communion, &c., may by God's mercy be saved; (I quoted his words for that before,) but adds, 'But as for you, you cannot be secure, if any by your order have died without the said sacraments, that you shall not be severely judged, (though the mercy of Almighty God make it up in them,) unless your true humility do procure your pardon,' &c. The stubborn bishop would not obey; but recriminated: he sent word to the archbishop<sup>u</sup>, saying, 'You gave me an example: I have a village in your diocese,' &c. 'and you excommunicated them: and I have an account of how  
770 'many infants died without baptism, and men without (A.D. 870.) 'the communion,' &c. The archbishop denied this; the matter is brought before the synod held in Attiniacum<sup>x</sup>. They condemn the bishop of Laudun.

Now see what Mr. Danvers makes of this; (which I set down as a specimen: not that I mean to trouble the reader with tracing him any further, whatever I have done myself:) he relates it thus<sup>y</sup>:

'Hinemarus, bishop of Laudun in France in the ninth century, renounced children's baptism, and refused any more to baptize any of them, so that they grew up without baptism, yea, many died without it,' &c.—'For which he and his diocese was accused in the synod of Accincus in France, in these words; "Ne missas celebrarent, aut infantes baptizarent, aut pœnitentes absolverent,

<sup>s</sup> [See above, p. 462.]

<sup>t</sup> Hinemari Rhemensis Opuscul. 55. capitum, cap. 28, &c. ad 48.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. Præfatio.

<sup>x</sup> [Attiniacum, now *Attigny*, is a small town of France, in the province of Champagne, seated on the river Aisne. At present it is the head of a canton. It is

a place of considerable antiquity, and memorable as the seat of several important synods and councils, and the residence of several of the early kings of France.]

<sup>y</sup> Treatise, part ii. cap. 7. p. 233. edit. 1674.



‘aut mortuos sepelirent;’ (which he translates, contrary to the idiom of Latin phrase, and to the tenour of the history, ‘that they neither celebrated mass, baptized children, absolved the penitents, or buried the dead.’ Whereas the accusation was not against the diocese, but against the bishop only, that he had excommunicated them and interdicted his clergy, ‘ne missas celebrarent,’ &c. ‘that they should not [or could not] say mass, baptize children, absolve penitents, or bury the dead.’ And he quotes for this, ‘*Bibl. Patrum*, tom. ix. part. ii. p. 137; *Magd. Cent.* ix. c. 4. p. 40, 41, 43; ‘Dutch Martyrology, p. 244. part i.’

Now for Dutch Martyrology I will by no means answer. But this I will undertake, that whoever looks into *Hinemarus’ Opusculum*, which is recited in *Bibl. Patrum*, tom. ix. part. ii. p. 93, &c. [p. 137 seems to be a mistake of the printer,] ed. Colon. 1618; or into *Magd. Cent.* ix. c. 9. p. 443, [which is the place that must be meant, though his print be c. 4. p. 40, 41, 43,] edit. Basil. 1547, [p. 443. tit. *Synodus apud Acciniacum*, edit. Basil. 1565,] will find the account of the matter as I have told it, and no other.

Now at such a rate of quoting, reciting, translating, and altering, he may find antipædobaptists in every age and at any place. It is abundance of the quotations that he has brought, which I as well as Mr. Baxter and Mr. Wills have searched, and never found any, not so much as one, (of those I mean which are for the centuries aforesaid from 400 to 1000, and seemed to be any thing material,) but what had some such mistake as this, or a worse, in the applying of them. But I shall not go on to recite them, especially since the foresaid writers have done it already<sup>z</sup>. One would wonder what he meant to make of this Hinemarus: if we can conceive that he thought his opinion to be against baptizing children, did he think that he judged burying the dead unlawful too?

II. But about the year of Christ 1050, there are quotations that have better foundation, and a greater appearance of truth, and do at least deserve an examination; concerning Bruno, bishop of Angers, and Berengarius, archdeacon of the same church; and about a hundred years after, some concerning the Waldenses of yet greater credit.

Bruno and Berengarius seem to have aimed at a reformation of some corrupt doctrines then in the church of Rome. They had an opportunity more advantageous than ordinary, one being bishop,

<sup>z</sup> Baxter, *More Proofs*, &c. Wills, *Infant-baptism asserted*; item, *Infant-baptism reasserted*.

and the other archdeacon of the same place. They are said to have begun their attempt about 1035, when Berengarius was <sup>935.</sup> (A.D. 1035.) but a young man, for he lived fifty years after that time. They opposed transubstantiation, for which they had a great many mouths open, and many pieces wrote against them. Among which many, there is one (not written by one of the same nation, but a foreigner, who owns that he speaks by hearsay) that charges them with some error that did overthrow infant-baptism. It is a letter <sup>950.</sup> written by (Durandus, bishop of Liege, as Baronius and (A.D. 1050.) the editors of the *Bibl. Patrum* had supposed; but as bishop Ussher<sup>a</sup> and F. Mabillon<sup>b</sup> have fully proved, by) Deodwinus, bishop of Liege, to Henry I. king of France. The words are<sup>c</sup>:

‘There is a report come out of France, and which goes through all Germany, that these two do maintain that the Lord’s body [the host] is not the body, but a shadow and figure of the Lord’s body. And that they do disannul lawful marriages: and as far as in them lies, overthrow the baptism of infants.’

Of Bruno we hear no more: probably he died.

But of Berengarius, the report that Deodwinus had heard was so far certainly true, as that he did deny the real presence in the sacrament, in that proper and corporal meaning, in which a great many then began to understand it. And there are a little after this <sup>955.</sup> a great many tracts written, and a great many councils<sup>d</sup> (A.D. 1055.) held against him and others of his opinion, for that sup-<sup>963.</sup> (A.D. 1063.) posed error. But none of those tracts, nor any of those councils, do object any error held by him in reference to matrimony or infant-baptism. And since he is found three or four several times to have been received to communion by his adversaries upon his recantation of that his opinion of the eucharist, without mention of any other; it is probable, and almost certain, that the report which Deodwinus had heard of his holding those other opinions was a mistake: or else that (as bishop Ussher<sup>e</sup> guesses) he had denied that baptism does confer grace *ex opere operato*: which was enough at that time to make his adversaries say, he did overthrow baptism. And that is Deodwin’s word: he does not say, they

<sup>a</sup> De Success. Eccles. p. 196. [cap. 7. sect. 24. p. 99. edit. fol. 1687.]

<sup>b</sup> Analect. tom. iv. p. 396. [Edit. 8vo. Lut. Paris. 1685: p. 446. edit. fol. Par. 1723.]

<sup>c</sup> Bibl. Patr. tom. xi. edit. Colon. 1618. Durandi Epist. [p. 432.]

<sup>d</sup> Concil. Turonense. Anno 1055. [edit. Mansi, tom. xix. p. 839.] Romanum 1063. [or 1059. See Concilia. edit. Mansi, tom. xix. p. 897.]

<sup>e</sup> De Success. Eccles. cap. 7. sect. 37. p. 105. edit. fol. Lond. 1687.]

denied it; but his words are, ‘Quantum in ipsis est, parvulorum ‘baptismum evertunt.’ ‘They, as far as in them lies, overthrow ‘the baptism of infants.’

Guitmund indeed, who is one of those many that I said wrote  
975. against Berengarius toward the latter end of his life  
(A.D. 1075.) about his opinion of the other sacrament, does take notice of Deodwin’s letter, and of the report therein mentioned of his holding those other opinions: but he speaks of them as of tenets which Berengarius, if he ever held them, never did think fit to own or publish: for his words<sup>f</sup> are, that ‘Berengarius finding that those ‘two opinions [of marriage and baptism] would not be endured by ‘the ears even of the worst men that were: and that there was no ‘pretence in Scripture to be brought for them: betook himself ‘wholly to uphold the other, [viz. that against transubstantiation,] ‘in which he seemed to have the testimony of our senses on his ‘side, and against which none of the holy Fathers had so fully ‘spoken, and for which he picked up some reasons and some places ‘of Scripture misunderstood,’ &c.

970. (A.D. 1070.) This is what he says as by report from Deod-

950. (A.D. 1050.) win’s letter. And for his other adversaries<sup>g</sup>,

1030. (A.D. 1130.) Lanfranc, Adelman<sup>h</sup>, Algerus<sup>i</sup>, and others, they do not at all, as I can find, mention any thing about baptism.

One thing I do here note by the by: that both this Guitmund, and the others mentioned, do so maintain the doctrine of transubstantiation against Berengarius, as that they say nothing of worshipping the host, nor any thing from whence one may gather that it was then practised in the church of Rome itself. I believe they then held transubstantiation, as the Lutherans do now consubstantiation, so as not to worship the host as the papists do now.

Now for the next age after this; the author of the acts of Bruno archbishop of Triers cited by bishop Ussher<sup>k</sup> says, that the said Bruno taking on him to expel those that were of the Berengarian sect out of his diocese, there were some found among them, who upon examination confessed their opinion to be, that ‘baptism does ‘no good to infants for their salvation.’ And the said author tells it upon his credit, that he was present at their confession, and heard them say so:

<sup>f</sup> De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Christi, lib. i. [apud Biblioth. Patrum, tom. xi. p. 350, &c. edit. Colon. 1618.]

<sup>g</sup> De Eucharistiæ Sacramento. [Apud Bibl. Patr. tom. xi. p. 337.]

<sup>h</sup> Epistola ad Berengarium de Veritate,

&c. [Bibl. Patr. xi. p. 348, &c.]

<sup>i</sup> De Sacramento Corporis et Sanguinis [Dominici, apud Bibl. Patr. xii. 410.]

<sup>k</sup> De Success. Eccles. c. 7. p. 207. [p. 105. edit. 1687.]



III. But it is probable that these were a sort of people that have <sup>1050.</sup> been since called Waldenses. For it must be observed, (A.D. 1150.) that in this age, viz. the twelfth century, several societies of men began to make a figure in the world, who differing from one another in some other matters, all agreed in renouncing the pope and see of Rome, and denying transubstantiation, and the worship of images, and some other grosser corruptions lately brought into that church. These were at first in several places called by several names and nicknames, but have been since by our English writers denoted by the general name of Waldenses. And one of the nicknames in use at this time was to call them *Berengarians*. Now whether those in Bruno's diocese, that were so called, did mean by that saying of theirs, that baptism itself is a thing of no use, to infants or any one else; or whether they put the emphasis on the word *infants*, does not appear: and there were about this time some sects that would say the one, and some that would be apt to say the other; as I shall shew.

Beside the name of Berengarians, other names that were severally used at several places and times, were these; Cathari [or Puritans], Paterines, Petrobrusians, Lyonists, Albigenses, Waldenses, and several more. And these, though differing many of them very much from one another, have been of late confusedly and by one general name called *Waldenses*. But the more exact accounts, and particularly Mr. Limborch's<sup>1</sup> history of the inquisition, do distinguish the Waldenses from the Albigenses, both as to their tenets and their places of abode. And it is, I think, only among the latter, that any antipædobaptists were found. As France was the first country in Christendom where dipping of children in baptism was left off; so there first antipædobaptism began.

But of these Waldenses so taken in a lump, the pædobaptist and antipædobaptist writers do at this time hotly dispute whether they held for or against infant-baptism.

The antipædobaptists produce the evidence of the popish writers of that time, who wrote against them: some of which do plainly and fully charge some of them with denying it.

The protestant pædobaptists say, this was one slander of many with which those their adversaries endeavoured to blacken them, because they condemned the errors and corruptions of the church of Rome: and produce for evidence several confessions of the Wal-

<sup>1</sup> Philippi a Limborch *Historia Inquisitionis*, fol. Amst. 1692. lib. i. cap. 8. p. 30. In English, by Sam. Chandler, 2vols. 4to.

1731. The same work abridged, 1 vol. 8vo. London, 1816.]

denses themselves, wherein they own infant-baptism. Now such confessions were doubtless more to be relied on than the accusations of their adversaries, if they were as ancient as they.

The present Waldenses, or Vaudois in Piedmont, who are the posterity of those old, do practise infant-baptism: and they were also found in the practice of it, when the protestants of Luther's reformation sent to know their state and doctrine, and to confer

<sup>1430.</sup> with them: and they themselves do say, that their (A.D. 1530.) fathers never practised otherwise. And they give proof of it from an old book of theirs, called the *Spiritual Almanack*<sup>m</sup>, where infant-baptism is owned: and Perrin, their historian, gives the reason of the report that had been to the contrary, viz. that their ancestors 'being constrained for some hundred years to suffer ' their children to be baptized by the priests of the church of Rome, ' they deferred the doing thereof as long as they could, because they ' had in detestation those human inventions that were added to the ' sacrament, which they held to be the pollution thereof. And for- ' asmuch as their own pastors were many times abroad, employed in ' the service of their churches, they could not have baptism admin- ' istered to their infants by their own ministers. For this cause ' they kept them long from baptism: which the priests perceiving, ' and taking notice of, charged them with this slander.' There are many other confessions of theirs of like import, produced by Perrin, Baxter, Wills, &c. This is the account the Waldenses give of themselves in those confessions, some of which seem to have been

<sup>1408.</sup> published about two hundred years ago. One, of the (A.D. 1508.) Bohemian Waldenses is dated 1508<sup>n</sup>.

But the antipædobaptists (some of them) say, this was by a corrupt compliance: for that 'about this time they made a great ' defection from their former principles and integrities, and have ' too much gendered since into the formalities of the Hugonots.'

<sup>1417.</sup> As if they had done it in compliance with Luther, who did (A.D. 1517.) not begin till 1517.

<sup>m</sup> Perrin. Hist. of Waldenses, lib. i. c. 4. [See *Histoire des Vaudois*, par J. P. Perrin. 12mo. A Geneve, 1619. Also *Luther's Fore-runners*, or a cloud of witnesses deposing for the Protestant faith, gathered together in the history of the Waldenses, &c. collected by J. P. P. L. [Jean Paul Perrin, Lionois] translated out of French, by Samson Lennard, 4to. London, 1624. —Lennard also translated and published at the same time, Perrin's '*Histoire des ' Chrétiens Albigeois*;' which had appeared by itself at Geneva, 12mo. 1618, but

in fact is only the second part of the joint work, embracing a history of both these people, together with such points of discipline and doctrine, as were common to the two. Some confusion arises from the mode of publication: parts two and three having appeared together, in 1618, paged consecutively, 1—156: 157—333, and part i. dated 1619, paged 1—248.]

<sup>n</sup> [Another, presented by them to the king of Bohemia, in the year 1533, is given at length in Leger's *Histoire*, &c. part i. p. 96.]

Yet they can produce no other or elder confession of theirs, that speaks contrary to these. There are extant several of their elder confessions, which express particularly the points in which they protested against what they held to be corrupt in the Romish doctrine and way, as against transubstantiation, chrism, extreme unction, &c., but do mention nothing, one way or other, about infant-baptism: which is a sign that that was none of the things they disowned. They do in several of their old books, copied in Perrin's history of them, speak of baptism and the other sacrament (for they owned but two). And in them they oppose themselves against the popish doctrine of the sacraments: and particularly they blame the papists for relying too much on the outward or visible part of them (as the protestants do now to the same purpose blame that tenet of theirs; that 'sacraments do confer grace *ex opere operato*, by the outward work done'). And there is one of them also that does mention the baptizing of children, but so as to leave the main question still ambiguous. It is their Treatise concerning

1020. Antichrist: written, as is pretended, anno 1120°. But I (A. D. 1120.) do not believe that; not having found any other account of this people so early. In it they say (as Perrin recites it at the end of his history<sup>p</sup>;) 'He [Antichrist] attributes the reformation ' of the Holy Spirit to a dead, outward faith, and baptizes children ' into that faith, that thereby baptism and regeneration must be ' had, and gives and receives orders, and other sacraments by that, ' grounding therein all his Christianity, which is against the Holy ' Spirit.' One party say, they do hereby condemn all baptizing of children, as a dead, outward work. The other say, they ought by these words to be understood to own baptizing of children; and to except only against the foresaid popish tenet: for, whether it be in children or grown persons, it is an antichristian or popish abuse to ascribe the regeneration to the dead outward work, or mere outward act; which ought especially to be ascribed to the grace or mercy of God, sealing and confirming the covenant to them. Perrin himself, who produces it, understands it so. And there is a Catechism of theirs, which Perrin says<sup>q</sup>, is composed out of their old books, that does expressly mention and own infant-baptism. But of what date that Catechism is, I know not.

<sup>o</sup> [See 'Histoire générale des Eglises évangéliques des Vallées de Piemont, ou Vaudoises: par Jean Leger,' folio, à Leyde, 1669. Livr. i. ch. 4. p. 26.]

<sup>p</sup> [Page 267. French edition, 1618. p. 75, English edit. 1624.]

<sup>q</sup> Part iii. lib. i. ch. 6. [p. 213. French edit. 1618; p. 43. English edit. 1624.]



1070. Bishop Ussher<sup>r</sup> quotes out of Hoveden's Annals in (A.D. 1170.) Henry II. fol. 319. edit. London, a confession of faith made by the *Boni homines* of Tholouse, (this was one name given to one of those sorts of men that have been since called *Waldenses*,) who being summoned and examined before a meeting of bishops, abbots, &c. repeated it before the assembly; but being urged to swear to it, refused. In the body of which confession they say; 'Credimus etiam quod non salvatur quis, nisi qui baptizatur: et parvulos salvari per baptismum.' 'We believe also that no person is saved, but what is baptized: and that infants are saved by baptism.' Mr. Baxter having been called upon by Danvers to produce any confession of theirs of any ancient date that owned infant-baptism, produces this<sup>s</sup>, which was about the year 1176, and (A.D. 1176.) says, 'Would you have a fuller proof?' But the other answer<sup>t</sup>, that this confession was not what they naturally and usually held: but what the court forced them to say by way of recantation: which proves rather, that they usually held the contrary, or were suspected so to do. This latter appears by the story to be the truth of the matter: and it is wonder Mr. Baxter would urge it. But however it signifies nothing to the purpose. For these men were Manichees, (as appears by the other opinions the court made them recant, viz. that there were 'two Gods, whereof the evil God 'made the visible world,' &c.) and consequently the opinions they held against baptism were against all baptism of old or young, hat it is good for nothing: and so when they denied 'that infants are 'saved by baptism;' their meaning was, that no person is ever the more saved for being baptized. This they then recanted. And this is a known tenet of the Manichees<sup>u</sup>: of whom there were many in these parts, whose story is confounded with that of the other Waldenses, as I shall shew by and by.

It is to be noted, that they that write against them do accuse them of abundance of heresies and monstrous doctrines: and that with great variety<sup>x</sup>. One writer of one time and place accuses those that he writes against (whom he calls by such or such a name, as Puritans, Apostolics, &c.) of one set of false doctrines; and another writer, of another time and country, lays to the charge of those that he writes against, whom he names perhaps by some other name, as Arnoldists, &c. another catalogue of heterodox opinions. But one

<sup>r</sup> De Success. Eccles. cap. viii. p. 242.

[§ 34. p. 122. edit. 1687.]

<sup>s</sup> More Proofs, p. 380.

<sup>t</sup> Second Reply, [ch. ii. § 5. p. 84.]

<sup>u</sup> See ch. v. § 3.

<sup>x</sup> [See a collection of these, edited by the Jesuit Gretser, 4<sup>o</sup>. *Ingolstadt*, 1614, and reprinted in the 'Bibliotheca Patrum,' tom. xiii. p. 228-344. edit. *Coloniæ*, 1618.]

general thing that they were all guilty of, is their renouncing and defying the church and pope of Rome.

And for the other opinions, (such I mean as are really false ones, and not only by the papists so accounted,) they run for the most part on the vein of the old Manichean heresy; and they do often expressly call them Manichees. The old Manichees held two principles, or gods; the one good and the other evil; and that the evil god made the material world: they renounce and blaspheme the Old Testament, and part of the New: they denied the resurrection of the body, believing that a man survives after death only by his soul: they had no use of baptism nor of marriage: they abhorred the eating of any flesh, &c. These same opinions, and other of the old Manichees, are generally the chief ingredients in the heresies imputed to these men.

There is also great variety in the account of their morals. Some give to those they describe, the character of sober, just, and conscientious men; though of heretical opinions. Others paint those they write against as men of lewd lives as well as doctrines. Most of the books against them are between the year 1140 and (A.D. 1140.) the year 1400. What was done against them afterward was chiefly by fire and sword. Several armies were, by the instigation of popes, and the forwardness of princes, sent against them: which sometimes dispersed them but could never extirpate them.

The countries that were fullest of them, were the south parts of France, for the Albigenses; and the north parts of Italy, and the valleys between the Alps, for the Waldenses. Which last place proved so good a refuge for them, that they have continued and do continue there to this day: save that the French king has lately

y [The reader, who is desirous of obtaining more ample information on these matters, is referred to the following works:]

1. Perrin's *Histoire des Vaudois*, 1619.
2. Or, its translation by Lennard, 1624; as described in a former note.
3. P. Gilles, *Histoire des Eglises Reformées de Piedmont*, 4<sup>o</sup>. Geneva, 1644.
4. S. Morland's *History of the evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont*, folio, London, 1658.
5. Jean Leger, *Histoire des Eglises évangéliques des Vallées de Piedmont*, folio, a Leyde, 1669.
6. *The History of the Vaudois*, by Peter Boyer, 12<sup>o</sup>. London, 1692.
7. *Remarks on the Ecclesiastical His-*

*tory of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont*, by Peter Allix, 4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1690; reprinted at Oxford, 8<sup>o</sup>. 1821.

8. *Remarks on the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of the Albigenses*, by the same, 4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1692; reprinted at Oxford, 8<sup>o</sup>. 1821.
9. Henri Arnaud, *Histoire de la glorieuse Rentrée des Vaudois dans leurs Vallées*, 8<sup>o</sup>. 1710.
10. A translation of the preceding work, with a compendious history of that people, by H. D. Acland, 8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1827.
11. *An Excursion to the Mountains of Piemont, and researches among the Vaudois*, by W. S. Gilly, 4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1824; 8<sup>o</sup>. corrected and enlarged edition, 1825.]

driven out those that lived within his limits, and forced them to seek habitations in Germany and elsewhere. Yet some say that the inhabitants of the Cevennes, that are now in arms, are also the offspring of this people.

It must be noted further, as to the matter of baptism, that some of the foresaid writers do represent those against whom they write, as denying all baptism: some others do so speak of them whom they oppose, as if they allowed baptism to the adult, but not to infants: and others, among all the false doctrines which they charge on those they write against, mention no error about baptism at all.

Now see the power of prejudice, which it has to make each party construe and interpret the same relations of matter of fact to the sense that their side would have to be true. The papists believe that all the accusations of these people are true: and that they were such in all points as those old monks and inquisitors have painted them. The protestant paedobaptists think that they really held those tenets against the church of Rome; but that all the rest are false and malicious accusations; among which they reckon that of their denying infants' baptism for one. And this is what the present Waldenses themselves do affirm. The anti-pædobaptists say, that all the protestant doctrines are truly imputed to them, and so is their denial of infant-baptism, but all the rest are false.

IV. I shall by no means undertake a recital of all the particular quotations: partly because they are so numerous, confused, and contrary to one another; but especially because they are so far below the date of those times which I have set myself to examine. Whatever the tenets of these men were, they are much too late to give us any direction about the sense of the primitive church. I shall only take hold of a handle which some of each of our opposite parties do give of an expedient to reconcile this historical difference. Which is by slitting the matter in dispute, and supposing that some sects of these people did deny infant-baptism, and others not.

For as Mr. Baxter says at one place<sup>z</sup>, 'Now I leave it to the reader, among many uncertainties, which of these he will believe most probable. 1. That all the parties were slandered: 2. Or that Peter and Henry were slandered, by occasion of the mixed Manichees, or by the vulgar lying levity, or popish malice. 3. Or whether Peter and Henry were guilty, as some now, though the



‘rest were not. 4. Or,’ &c.——. ‘Believe which of these you find most cause.’

So likewise on the other side, Mr. Tombes says<sup>z</sup>: ‘As for the Albigenes and Waldenses, it might be true that some might be against infant-baptism, yet others not:—Or it may be that they all at the beginning held so; but after left it.’ And Mr. Danvers<sup>a</sup>: ‘Neither would I be thought to assert such an universal harmony amongst the Waldenses in this thing, but that it is possible there might be some difference among some of them, even in this particular.’

So far they come toward a compliance. And there is nothing in so obscure a matter, and so perplexed an account, more probable than this. And to evince it, I shall,

1. Shew that there were many several sects of those men, whom we now call by one general name Waldenses.

2. Produce what proofs there are that some of them denied infant-baptism: and what probability they carry.

3. Shew how it appears of the most of them, that they did not deny it.

First, however later writers have agreed for method’s sake to call them by one general name of Waldenses, (because that is the name that those which now remain call themselves by,) yet it is plain that at the beginning they were of several sorts, names, and opinions. Bishop Ussher, in his book *de Successione Ecclesiæ*, has proved, by good historical evidences, that there were some real Manichees that crowded in amongst them: which, as he supposes, gave occasion to the papists to slander the whole body. For the Manichees did really condemn all baptism, as the Quakers do now: and held many other of the worst opinions which are now affixed to the Quakers.

1060. Eckbertus Schonaugiensis<sup>b</sup> wrote, anno 1160, a treatise (A. D. 1160.) against a people then spread in many countries, ‘whom,’ says he, ‘our Germans call *Cathari*, puritans; the Flemish call them *Piphles*; the French, *Texerant*<sup>c</sup>: (I suppose it is misprinted, ‘he interprets it *weavers*.’) Their tenets, which he repeats, shew them to be Manichees: such as, the unlawfulness of marriage; of eating any flesh, as being the creature of the Devil; that Christ had no true human nature, &c. He had disputed with several of

<sup>z</sup> Præcursor, p. 36 [4to. London, 1652.]

<sup>a</sup> Treatise, part ii. ch. 7. p. 321. second edition.

<sup>b</sup> Serm. i. Bibl. Patrum, tom. xii. edit.

Colon. 1618. [p. 898.]

<sup>c</sup> [This seems to be a misprint for *Tisserands*.]

them: and he says, Serm. 1. ‘They are also divided among themselves; for several things that are maintained by some of them are denied by others.’ And of baptism particularly, he says; ‘Of baptism they speak variously: that baptism does no good to infants, because they cannot of themselves desire it, and because they cannot profess any faith. But there is another thing which they more generally hold concerning that point, though more secretly, viz. that no water-baptism at all does any good for salvation: and therefore such as come over to their sect they rebaptize by a private way, which they call *baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire.*’

And in Serm. 8, which is a chapter on purpose to prove to them the use of water-baptism, (as the 7th is to prove infant-baptism,) he tells how this *baptism with fire* was: and he says he had heard it from one that had been at their secret meetings. It is in short thus; in a close room they light candles or torches, as many as can be placed, round by the walls and every where. The company stand in order with great reverence: the person that is to be baptized (*sive catharizandus*, or puritanized) is placed in the midst: the Archicatharus standing by him, with a book used to this purpose, lays the book on his head, and pronounces certain benedictions, the rest praying the while. This is called baptism with fire, because of the lights around, which make the room look almost as if it were on fire. But he tells them; ‘This is not the way, you heretics; nor to the purpose that you pretend. You ought to make a good roasting fire, and put him in,’ &c.

What he says of their slighting all water-baptism, but especially infant-baptism, does help to make one understand many passages that we meet with in the writings against these men. The sayings of many sorts of them, that are quoted as speaking against infant-baptism, ought not to be so taken as that they approved baptism of the adult, and denied it to infants: but they really looked on all water-baptism as a superstitious thing; only they thought it yet more absurd in the case of infants. They laughed at the Christians for two things: one, that they placed religion in washing people at all; and the other, that they did it to infants. When their arguments failed against baptism in general, they took the advantage of the incapacity of infants. And so do now the Quakers, some of the Socinians, the Deists, and such other sects as would have men go by reason rather than by Scripture; they undervalue this sacrament in general, but they particularly deride the applying of it to infants.

1295.  
(A.D. 1395.) Pilichdorf also, writing against these men<sup>d</sup>, gives an account of the difference of their several sects: he says, [ch. 12.] ‘the Waldenses do dislike, and even loath the Runcarians, ‘Beghards, and Luciferians.’ And that ‘whereas all catholics from ‘the four quarters of the world agree in the unity of the faith, the ‘heretics do not so, but some of them condemn the rest,’ &c.

1154.  
(A.D. 1254.) erius. He knew all the sorts, differences, and circumstances of those people that have been since styled Waldenses, better than any man. He had lived among them, and had been one of one sort of them for seventeen years, and then after his renouncing of them was made an inquisitor against them. It is pity that he had neither a style to write clearly, nor the candour to express their tenets fairly: he in representing their opinions frequently gives a turn to the expressions, which shews that his aim was to paint them as odious as he could. And that especially in the case of the Lyonists: for the others, they could not well be painted worse than they were. But these had gained such a repute by the innocence of their lives, and the soundness of their faith; that they did more hurt to the church of Rome than all the rest: therefore he does, as any one will perceive, endeavour to blacken their opinions in the recital.

He gives an account of seven sects of these men<sup>e</sup>. The Lyonists, or poor men of Lyons, the Runcarians, the Siscidenses, the Ortlimbenses, the Paterins, the Ordibarians, and the Cathari, or puritans. It was of these last that he had been: which held the worst and most blasphemous opinions; ‘That the Devil [or evil god] made ‘this world and all things in it: that all the sacraments of the ‘church, viz. the sacrament of baptism of material water, and the ‘other sacraments, profit nothing to salvation, and are no true ‘sacraments of Christ and his church, but vain and devilish.— ‘Also that all infants, *etiam non baptizati*, even those that are not ‘baptized, are punished eternally, no less than murderers and ‘thieves<sup>f</sup>.’ After a great many horrid opinions, he describes a practice which they used instead of baptism. They called it *the consolation*<sup>g</sup>, and *the spiritual baptism*, or *the baptism with the Holy Spirit*. It had no use of water, nor of the Christian form of baptism.

It is remarkable what he says of one sect of these Cathari:

<sup>d</sup> Contra sectam Waldensium, c. 12.  
[apud Bibl. Patrum, tom. xiii. p. 312, &c.]

<sup>e</sup> Lib. adv. Waldenses, cap. 5, 6. apud

Bibl. Patr. tom. 13. edit. Colon. 1618.  
[p. 297, &c.]

<sup>f</sup> Cap. 6.

<sup>g</sup> [Consolamentum.]



that they held ‘that Christ did not take on him human nature of ‘the blessed Virgin, but took on him a body that was heavenly ‘[or from heaven].’ This was the opinion of some old heretics, and is said to be held by the present Minnists.

He says, the first of this sect came from Bulgaria, and a country that he calls Dugranicia. They were doubtless an offspring of the old Manichees; who, as well as these later, made use of the name of Jesus Christ, but denied the true history of him; and framed a notion of him more enthusiastical than that which the worst sort of our Quakers do by the name of Jesus Christ within them.

These Cathari, it seems, thought water-baptism a devilish thing: but that even without it infants (and men too that were not initiated in, and rescued by their rites) would be damned, as being of the Devil’s make. Yet here, the Albanenses, one sect of the Cathari, dissent, Reinerius says; and say, ‘No creature of the good ‘God shall perish.’ I suppose they meant, that their body shall be damned; but their soul, because that is made by the good God, shall be saved.

The Runcarians and Paterins say likewise, ‘that Lucifer created ‘all visible things.’ One would think these should be the same that others call the Luciferians; but that Pilichdorf, in the place I mentioned, distinguishes them. These (and the Ortlibenses and Siscidenses, of whom he says little) have nothing about baptism. The Siscidenses, he says, hold the same as the Waldenses: ‘save ‘that they receive the communion.’ Now whom he means by the Waldenses I know not; for this is the only place where (A. D. 1154. A. D. 1254.) he uses the name. This man wrote anno 1254.

The Ordibarians say, ‘The world had no beginning; that Christ ‘was a sinner till he became of their sect. They deny the resurrection of the body, but not the immortality of the spirit [or ‘soul]: they say, baptism is of no further value than are the ‘merits of the baptizer: and that it does no good to infants, unless ‘they be perfect in that sect.’ So the words are; *nisi sint perfecti in illa secta*. I think they mean, unless they be initiated in that sect, *τελειούμενοι*.

Of the Lyonists he says thus<sup>h</sup>:

‘There is no sect more pernicious to the church than they,’ &c.

Of the sacraments he says, ‘they condemn them all.’ This appears to be invidiously expressed; for, by his own account of the particulars, they did (to say the worst) only hold some heterodox opinions about them.

<sup>h</sup> Cap. 4.

First, for baptism, ‘they say that catechism is nothing.’ This also must be maliciously worded; for no people ever, that believed the articles of the Creed, would hold catechising of children to be useless. But I guess by catechism here is meant the interrogations and answers at the baptizing of an infant. ‘Also, that the washing ‘that is given to children does no good.’ By words so short one cannot tell which of these three tenets he would accuse them to hold: either, 1, that all baptismal washing is good for nothing. For so a Quaker now would say, ‘the washing you give your ‘children is good for nothing:’ when his meaning is, that all baptism is so. But these people do not seem to have been Manichees. Or, 2ndly, that baptism is of no force when it is given to infants. But then it would have been plainer expressed: and he would have used the word *baptismus*, and not *ablutio*, which is spoken in disdain, and signifies an ordinary washing. Or, 3dly, that in baptism, the washing itself, or outward act taken by itself, is not that which saves, but God operating saves by it, as St. Peter says<sup>i</sup>, *It is not the washing off the dirt of the flesh that saves*. This last I take to be what they might be likely to say. And this was a great heresy in those times, to deny that the sacraments do confer grace, *ex opere operato*: ‘even by the mere outward work done.’ Also, ‘that the godfathers do not understand what they answer to ‘the priest.’ Also, ‘that the offering which is called *anwegung* is ‘an invention.’ Also, ‘they dislike all the exorcisms and benedictions of baptism.’

Here is evidence more than enough that there were several sects of this people. Which is what I proposed to prove by these passages.

V. And now, secondly, that some of them (I do not say, any of the Waldenses strictly so called; but some of these sects, which about the same time and the same places opposing the church of Rome, are therefore by late writers huddled together under the name of Waldenses; that some of these, I say) did deny infants’ baptism, there is this ground of probability.

First, one Evervinus of the diocese of Cologne, a little before the 1040. year 1140, writes to St. Bernard a letter, (which is lately (A.D. 1140.) brought to light by F. Mabillon, *Analect.* tom. iii.)<sup>k</sup> giving him an account of two sorts of heretics lately discovered in that country. One sort were, by his description, perfect Manichees. Of the other sort, he says; ‘They condemn the sacraments, except ‘baptism only; and this only in those who are come to age, who

<sup>i</sup> 1 Ep. iii. 21.

<sup>k</sup> [And p. 473, of the later edition, fol. Paris, 1723.]

‘ they say are baptized by Christ himself, whoever be the minister of the sacraments. They do not believe infant-baptism: alleging that place of the Gospel; *he that believeth, and is baptized,*’ &c. ‘ All marriage they call fornication, except that which is between two virgins,’ &c.

1046. Then at the year 1146, Peter, abbot of Clugny, writing (A.D. 1146.) against one Peter Bruis, and one Henry his disciple, and their associates<sup>1</sup>, charges them with six errors: the first of which was their denial of infant-baptism. The other five were: 2. ‘ that churches ought not to be built; and if built, ought to be pulled down.’ If we were to credit all the reports that come now from France, the Cevennois would seem to be of this opinion, by their destroying so many churches: but I hope that those reports are not true. 3. ‘ That crosses ought not to be worshipped, but broken and burnt.’ Peter Bruis had been, a little before the writing of this, taken and burnt himself. This writer says, it was a just judgment on him, who had burnt so many crosses. 4. ‘ That not only what Berengarius had said, viz. “ That there is no transubstantiation in the sacrament,” was true: but also that that sacrament is no more to be administered since Christ’s time.’ 5. ‘ That dead men receive no benefit from the prayers, sacrifices, &c. of the living.’ 6. ‘ That it is a mocking of God to sing in the church.’

He also says, that they were reported to ‘ renounce all the Old Testament, and all the New, except the four Gospels.’ But this he was not sure of: and would not impute it to them, for fear he might slander them. So it appears that he did not certainly know what they held. Yet to make his proofs unquestionable, he first proves the truth of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, by their agreement with the Gospels: and then the Old Testament by the New. And then out of the whole proceeds to refute their tenets, bestowing a chapter on each. The first of them was, as I said, against infant-baptism; and is thus expressed.

The first proposition of the new heretics. They say,

‘ Christ sending his disciples to preach, says in the Gospel; *Go ye out into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned.* From these words of our Saviour it is plain that none can be saved unless he believe and be baptized; that is, have both Christian faith and baptism. For not one of these, but both together, does save. So that infants, though they be by you

<sup>1</sup> Epist. contra Petrobrusianos, [apud Bibl. Patrum, tom. xii. p. 206, &c. edit. Colon. 1618.]



‘baptized, yet since by reason of their age they cannot believe, are  
 ‘not saved. It is therefore an idle and vain thing for you to wash  
 ‘persons with water, at such a time when you may indeed cleanse  
 ‘their skin from dirt in a human manner, but not purge their  
 ‘souls from sin. But we do stay till the proper time of faith: and  
 ‘when a person is capable to know his God, and believe in him;  
 ‘then we do (not, as you charge us, rebaptize him, but) baptize  
 ‘him. For he is to be accounted as not yet baptized, who is not  
 ‘washed with that baptism by which sins are done away.’

This is, as to the practice, perfectly agreeable with the modern  
 antipædobaptists: but, as Cassander observes<sup>m</sup>, it is upon quite  
 contrary grounds. For the antipædobaptists now do generally  
 hold, that all that die infants, baptized or not, of Christian or of  
 heathen parents, are saved; and so it is needless to baptize them:  
 whereas these held that, baptized or not, they could not be saved;  
 and so it was to no purpose to baptize them. And this writer does  
 accordingly spend most of the chapter, which is in answer to this  
 tenet of theirs, in proving that infants as well as grown men are  
 capable of the kingdom. ‘Abate,’ says he, ‘of that overmuch  
 ‘severity which you have taken upon you,—and do not exclude  
 ‘infants from the kingdom of heaven; of whom Christ says, *Of*  
 ‘*such is the kingdom of heaven.*’ Also he argues that the infants of  
 the Jews had a possibility of being saved, viz. if they were circum-  
 cised; and if the children of Christians have no means to be saved,  
 we are in much worse case than they: and at last he concludes that  
 chapter: ‘Oh the difference that is between merey and cruelty,  
 ‘between a tender regard to one’s children, and unnaturalness,  
 ‘between Christ lovingly receiving infants, and the heretics im-  
 ‘piously repelling them,’ &c.

It is to be noted, that this author speaks of this opinion as then  
 1026. lately set on foot; and says, it might have seemed not to  
 (A. D. 1126.) need or deserve any confutation, ‘were it not that it had  
 ‘now continued twenty years<sup>n</sup>. That the first seeds of it were sown  
 ‘by Peter de Bruis’ (who was living when the book was written,  
 but put to death before it was published, of which mention is made  
 in the preface). It was first vented in the mountainous country of  
 Dauphiné, and had had there some followers: from whence being  
 in good measure expelled, it had got footing in Gaseoigne, and the  
 parts about Tholouse, being propagated by Henry, who was a dis-  
 ciple and successor of the said Peter.

<sup>m</sup> De Baptismo Infantium.

<sup>n</sup> Præfatio et initium libri, [p. 206 G. et 208 B.]

This writer aggravates this charge of novelty, by urging, that if baptism given in infancy be null and void, as they pretended; then ‘all the world has been blind hitherto, and by baptizing infants for ‘above a thousand years, has given but a mock-baptism, and made ‘but fantastical Christians, &c.—And whereas all France, Spain, ‘Germany, Italy, and all Europe, has had never a person now for ‘three hundred or almost five hundred years baptized otherwise than ‘in infancy, it has had never a Christian in it.’

<sup>1047.</sup> The next year, 1147, Bernard, abbot of Clareval, com-  
(A.D. 1147.) monly called St. Bernard, was desired by pope Eugenius to accompany some bishops whom he sent into those parts, to stop the spreading of these doctrines, and to reduce those that had been led into them. And when they were come nigh to the territory of the earl of St. Gyles’, Bernard writes a letter to the said earl<sup>o</sup>, who at that time harboured the foresaid Henry in his country, recounting what mischiefs that heretic, as he calls him, had done. ‘The ‘churches are without people, the people without priests, &c. ‘God’s holy place is accounted profane, the sacraments are es- ‘teemed unholy, &c. Men die in their sins, their souls carried to ‘that terrible judicature, alas! neither reconciled by penance, nor ‘strengthened by the holy communion: the infants of Christians ‘are hindered from the life of Christ, the grace of baptism being ‘denied them: nor are they suffered to come to their salvation, ‘though our Saviour compassionately cry out in their behalf, saying, ‘*Suffer little children to come to me,*’ &c. He tells the earl, that it is little for his credit to harbour such a man that had been expelled from all places of France where he had come. The issue was, Henry was banished.

I know not whether it was before this, or after, (I think it was after,) that St. Bernard writing his sixty-fifth and sixty-sixth Sermon on the Canticles<sup>p</sup>, takes occasion to discourse largely against a sort of heretics, whom he names not, but says they called themselves apostolical men. He describes them thus in several places of those two sermons: 1st, ‘that they held it unlawful to ‘swear in any other case: but being examined of their tenets, they ‘would swear and forswear in the denial of them.’ And that ‘to ‘conceal their opinions, they would give catholic answers to all ‘questions of the faith; they would go to church, shew respect to ‘the minister, offer their gift, receive the sacrament,’ &c. He shews by Scripture that all true religion owns itself. And this receiving the communion in dissimulation, is what Reinerius,

<sup>o</sup> Epist. 240. [Op. tom. ii. p. 275. edit. Paris. 1586.]

[<sup>p</sup> Op. tom. i. p. 988, &c.]

1154. about a hundred years after this time, observes, that the (A. D. 1254.) Siscidenses would then do, and the Lyonists, he says, would; but the Waldenses would not. 2. 'That they held marriage to be a wicked uncleanness, (only some of them said that virgins might marry, but none else,) and yet they kept company with women in a way that gave great scandal: and women used to run away from their husbands and come and live with them. 'That they held uncleanness to be only in the use of a wife:' whereas that is, as he shews, the only case which makes it to be none. 3. 'That they held the eating of all flesh, and milk, and whatever is generated of copulation, unlawful.' He says if they did this out of desire to keep under the body, he would not blame them: but if it was out of a Manichean principle, (for this as well as the foregoing was a tenet of the old Manichees,) they fell under that censure of the apostle<sup>1</sup>, teaching *doctrines of devils—forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, &c.* 4. 'That they owned not the Old Testament, and some of them none of the New, but the Gospels.' 5. 'That they denied purgatory.' 6. 'They laugh at us,' says he, 'for baptizing infants, for our praying for the dead, and for desiring the prayers of the saints.' So he gives in opposition to them the grounds of infant-baptism, as well as of the other doctrines by them denied.

The heretics he speaks of here, appear plainly to have been of Manichean principles; and so probably to have derided all baptism: whereas Henry, as well as Peter Bruis, allowed of water-baptism to the adult: so that probably these mentioned in the sermons are not the same with those in the letter; for Peter and Henry are charged with no Manichean doctrine, save that Peter of Clugny had heard some say, that they denied all the Scripture but the Gospels; but he owns that he had no certain account of that: and probably the report that imputed it to them arose by mistaking the tenets of these for those.

1092. Then at the year 1192, one Alanus reckoning up the (A. D. 1192.) opinions of the Cathari, says, some of them held baptism of no use to infants; others of them to no persons at all.

It is to be noted, that neither Petrus nor Bernard do call them that they write against, Waldenses; nor do so much as mention the name: nor was there, I believe, any such name then known.

These are the only four writers that I know of, that do plainly accuse those they write against, of denying baptism *peculiarly* to infants. And the only persons they mention are, that Peter and



Henry, and their followers: for those of Cologne seem to have rambled thither from Dauphiné where Bruis had begun to preach about twenty years before.

Mr. Stennet, in his answer to Russen, ch. iv. p. 84, would indeed have us believe that there were, above one hundred years (A.D. 1025.) before this time, viz. anno 1025, some that denied baptism peculiarly to infants, namely, the followers of Gundulphus. For this, he quotes a passage reported by Dr. Allix<sup>r</sup> from the history of a synod held at Arras that year, which is lately brought to light by Dacherius, *Spicileg.* tom. xiii, where these men, being examined by the bishop of Cambray, do indeed deny that baptism can do any good to infants. But in the same examination being farther interrogated, the men confessed that they thought water-baptism of no use or necessity to any one, infant or adult. Now this is not fair quoting, to take the first of these, and leave out the latter part which follows in Dr. Allix's book. These men, whom Mr. Stennet represents as antipædobaptists, (and if they had been so, they would have been the earliest that any history mentions,) were, as to the point of baptism, Quakers or Manichees.

And so all the other writers that I have seen (except the four aforesaid) do, if they have any thing at all about the denial of baptism, impute to the heretics they speak of, the denial of all water-baptism. As the fragments of the history of Aquitain, cited by Pithæus; Joannes Floriacensis cited by Massonius; Radulphus Ardensis, and many more, whose sayings are produced by bishop Ussher<sup>s</sup>. The words of Eckbertus I gave before<sup>r</sup>, 'that infants ought to have no baptism, and grown persons no water-baptism.' Reinerius, as I said, about the Lyonists speaks ambiguously. Erbrardus and Ermingardus are cited by Danvers<sup>u</sup>, as witnesses that some of whom they write denied infant-baptism: but Mr. Baxter having searched them says, that they speak of those people as denying the law and the prophets: maintaining the two gods, whereof the evil one made the world: denying the resurrection, and all use of marriage, or the lawfulness of it. So that they must have been Manichees, who do all of them deny all baptism, but especially infant-baptism.

William of Newburg, who lived then in England, describes some of these men by the name of Publiciani<sup>y</sup>, and by their being Gas-

<sup>r</sup> [In his 'Remarks on the Ancient Churches of Piedmont,' chap. ii.]

<sup>s</sup> Lib. de Success. Eccles. [cap. viii. § 22.]

<sup>t</sup> § 4.

<sup>u</sup> Treatise, part ii. chap. 7. page. 250. [Danvers however misspells the latter

name, *Ermengendus*.]

<sup>x</sup> More Proofs, p. 394.

<sup>y</sup> [Gulielmi Neubrigensis Historia rerum Anglicarum, cura Tho. Hearnii, 3 tom. 8°. Oxonii. 1719.] lib. ii. cap. 13.

coigners; and says, about thirty of them came out of Germany into England under Henry II, about 1170, and being examined of their faith, they denied and detested holy baptism, the eucharist, and marriage. Foxe<sup>z</sup>, out of *Historia Gisburnensis*, mentions the same men: and that the chief of them were Gerhardus and Dulcinus Navarensis. He gives no account of any opinion they had against baptism. But Holinshead<sup>a</sup> says, they derogated from the sacraments such grace, as the church by her authority had then ascribed to them.

Several councils and decretals made about this time do establish the doctrine of baptism both in general, and also particularly that of infants, in opposition, as it seems, to some that denied all baptism, and to others that denied that of infants. As for example,

1115. the Lateran council under pope Innocent III, anno 1215, (A.D. 1215.) cap. i: 'The sacrament of baptism performed in water with invocation of the Trinity is profitable to salvation, both to adult persons and also to infants, by whomsoever it is rightly administered in the form of the church.' And the said pope has

1099. in his Decretals a letter in answer to a letter from the (A.D. 1199.) bishop of Arles in Provence, which had represented to him that 'some<sup>b</sup> heretics there had taught that it was to no purpose to baptize children, since they could have no forgiveness of sins thereby, as having no faith, charity,' &c.

1039. Also the Lateran council under Innocent II, 1139, did (A.D. 1139.) condemn Peter Bruis, and Arnold of Brescia, who seems to have been a follower of Bruis, for rejecting infants' baptism.

These proofs do, I think, evince that there were some about this time that denied all baptism; and some others that denied peculiarly infant-baptism; among those parties of men that have been lately called Waldenses.

I know many pædobaptists believe neither of these, and Perrin their historian does endeavour to clear them of this as of a slander. Two things the pædobaptists say to this matter, which are very considerable.

I. That it is common for men to slander their adversaries about the opinions they hold: as appears not only by many instances in that ignorant age; in which the monks, who were then the only writers, verified in themselves too much that character quoted by St. Paul<sup>c</sup>, *always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies*: but also by too

<sup>z</sup> [Acts and Monuments, vol. i. p. 262. edit. 1641.]

<sup>a</sup> [Chronicles, year 1160. vol. iii. p. 68. edit. 1586.]

<sup>b</sup> Opera Innocentii Tertii, tom. ii. p. 776. edit. Colon. 1575.

<sup>c</sup> Tit. i. 12.

many in this age; as Vicecomes a learned papist has in this very matter to his own shame<sup>c</sup> left on record, that Luther, Calvin, and Beza were adversaries of infant-baptism.

2. That we ought in all reason either to deny credit to these popish writers concerning these men, or else to believe them in one thing as well as another. If we allow them for good witnesses, then those that they describe were men of such unsound opinions in other things, as that no church would be willing to own them for predecessors; but if we account them slanderers, we ought not to conclude from their testimony that any of these men denied infant-baptism; which does not appear by any of their own confessions, and which the present Waldenses do account as a slander cast on their ancestors.

These considerations do in great measure justify those pædobaptists, who maintain that there is no *certain* evidence of any church or society of men that opposed infant-baptism, till those in Germany<sup>1422.</sup> many about 180 years ago. The proof concerning any (A.D. 1522.) sort of the Waldenses is but probable. I owned before that the probability is such as does weigh with me for the Petrobrusians, and perhaps some of the Albigenses. But for the main body of Waldenses there is no probability at all.

VI. And now, thirdly, that there were several sects or sectaries of them that did not deny the baptism of infants, is proved from this; that a great many writers against them, diligently reciting the erroneous opinions of those they write against, and that often in smaller matters, yet mention nothing of this.

<sup>1136.</sup> Lucas Tudensis<sup>d</sup> writes largely against the Albigenses (A.D. 1236.) that were then in Spain: but among all the accusations of them, true or false, has nothing of this. Petrus de Pilichdorf

<sup>1295.</sup> (in the year 1395, as he himself gives the date, cap. 30,) (A.D. 1395.) writes a book of confutation of the several pretended errors of the Waldenses of his time in thirty-six chapters, but has nothing of baptism; though he descends to speak of many lesser matters, and aggravates all with very railing words, yet he finds nothing to accuse them of, but such things as the protestants now hold, except one or two, as the 'unlawfulness of all oaths,' &c.

<sup>1358.</sup> Æneas Sylvius wrote in 1458 his *Historia Bohemica*, in (A.D. 1458.) which he reckons up the tenets of the Picards, a sort of

<sup>c</sup> De Rit. Bapt. lib. ii. cap. 1. [See Josephi Vicecomitis *Observationes Ecclesiastice*, 4 tom. 4<sup>o</sup>. Mediolani, 1615, &c. tom. i. p. 103.]

<sup>d</sup> [See his work in four books, in vol.

13 of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. Cologne edition, 1618.]

<sup>e</sup> [See this in the same volume of the above-named collection.]



these men. But<sup>f</sup> he mentions no difference they had with the then established church about infant-baptism, save that they spoke against chrism, &c. And Foxe, reciting their tenets out of him, mentions only this, ‘that baptism ought to be administered with ‘pure water, without any hallowed oil.’ Naclerus also in his

<sup>1400.</sup> Chronicon, written 1500, recites their doctrines particu-  
(A. D. 1500.) larly<sup>g</sup>, and mentions no such thing as the denial of infant-baptism; yet he also takes notice of so small a matter, as that they affirmed water to be sufficient without oil. There are in Gretzer’s Collection<sup>h</sup> of pieces written against the Waldenses, six treatises in all (beside Reinerius and Pilchdorf mentioned already) reckoning up their heterodox opinions; but not one word of this. One of them is a direction to the inquisitors, in the examining of these men, how to discover and convict them; for it seems they kept their opinions very close; whereas if they had not baptized their children, nothing would have been a more ready conviction. The Magdeburgenses<sup>i</sup> have a catalogue of their opinions, taken as they

<sup>1360.</sup> say out of a very old manuscript; and nothing of this.  
(A. D. 1460.) Bishop Ussher quotes<sup>k</sup> also Jacob Piccolominaeus, Anto-  
<sup>1395.</sup>nius Bonfinius, Bernardus Lutzenburgensis, and several  
(A. D. 1495.) others treating of these sorts of men, who object nothing of this.

VII. I have, more than ever I meant to do, troubled myself in inquiring into the history of these men; and all that I can make of the inquiry is this:

First, there were a great many among them that really held the impious opinion of the Manichees: some of this sect were in these countries before the Waldenses, whom the protestants own for predecessors, arose or were taken notice of; which was after the year 1100. These, all of them, denied *all* water baptism. So the Quakers may claim kindred of them if they please; but no baptist, whether pædobaptist or antipædobaptist, can. They had an invention of their own, which they used instead of the Christian baptism, and which they called *spiritual baptism*: and they said<sup>l</sup>, ‘by it forgiveness of sins, and the Holy Spirit was given. It contained in it imposition of their hands, and the saying of the ‘Lord’s Prayer. Only one sect of them, the Albanenses, said the

<sup>f</sup> Ussher de Success. Eccles. cap. 6. [Sect. 15, 16. p. 80. edit. 1687.] Baxter, More Proofs, &c. p. 380.

<sup>g</sup> [See Johannis Naucleri Chronica, fol. Coloniae, 1579. vol. ii. Generat. 47. p. 1033.] Vol. ii. part ii. p. 265.

<sup>h</sup> Bibl. Patr., t. xiii. edit. Colon. 1618.

<sup>i</sup> Cent. 12. cap. 8. p. 1206. [tom. vii. edit. Basil. 1569.]

<sup>k</sup> De Success. Eccles. cap. 6. p. 155. Item, p. 306, &c. [p. 80. et 149, edit. fol. 1687.]

<sup>l</sup> Reinerius, cap. 6.

‘hand did no good; being, as all other flesh is, created by the Devil. So they used the prayer only.’

These men were thus far on the antipædobaptists’ side, that this mock-baptism of theirs they gave to the adult only. And they derided the Christians for two things: one, that they used baptism with water at all; and the other, that they gave it to persons that had no sense of it, viz. infants. And this, for aught I know, might be all the ground of the Waldenses (who by the first writers are not well distinguished from these men) being accused of denying infant-baptism.

This sort of men continued a considerable time. Reinerius says<sup>m</sup>,  
 1154. in his time ‘there were not above 4000 in all the world  
 (A. D. 1254.) ‘that were Cathari, quite pure [or perfect] of both sexes;  
 ‘but of Credentes (so they called their disciples that were not yet  
 ‘perfect) an innumerable multitude.’

Though the authors do not well distinguish the names, yet most generally this sort, that denied all baptism, and held the other vile opinions, are denoted by these names, Cathari, Apostolici, Luciferians, Runcarians, Popelicans, alias Publicans.

2. There were another sort that held none of those impious tenets of the Manichees, concerning two Gods, &c. But they joined with the other in inveighing against the church of Rome, which in these times began to be very corrupt. And the papists do sometimes confound these with the other, and affix to these some of the opinions of the other.

If any of these that owned water-baptism denied it to infants, and if Petrus Cluniacensis did not mistake their opinion upon the occasion aforesaid, it was the Petrobrusians, otherwise called Henricians. What Reinerius says of the Lyonists is very general and obscure: and of the others no such thing is said. Especially this is constant; that no one author that calls the people he writes of Waldenses, does impute to them the denial of infant-baptism.

3. If there were any such, they seem not to have continued long, but to have dwindled away or come over to those that practised infant-baptism; for none of the later writers concerning these men do charge them with any thing of this. This the reader will observe, if he mind the date of the year which I have affixed to each writer. And it is a manifest sign that either none of those whom we now denote by the name Waldenses, that owned water-baptism, held any thing against infant-baptism; but that the elder writers imputed it to them upon the mistake aforesaid of taking

<sup>m</sup> Reinerius, cap. 6.

the Manichees' opinions for theirs; or upon vulgar reports, which by this time appeared to be false: or else, that if there had been formerly any such sects in that great variety, they were by this time extinguished.

Pilichdorf writes against them under the name of Waldenses. Reinerius does but once just mention that name, as denoting one sect: one cannot tell which. But Pilichdorf entitles his book *Against the Sect of the Waldenses*, and calls them at every word *Waldensian heretics*; but ascribes no opinion to them that deserves that name, nor any error at all about baptism. He is the only man of their adversaries, who though he give them ill language, yet charges them with no particular opinion (or no material one) but

<sup>1295.</sup> what they themselves own in their confessions. He (A. D. 1395.) wrote, as I said, anno 1395, by which time their opinions must be justly and distinctly known. If they had formerly been mistaken to be of the same opinion with those Manichean sects, they had now had time to clear themselves from that imputation. And so we find by his words they did; for he says<sup>n</sup>, the Waldenses 'do dislike and even loathe the Runcarians, Beghards, and Luciferians.' And they seem by his description to have been in the  
<sup>1425.</sup> same state of religion that they were found in 130 years (A. D. 1525.) after by the protestants.

And he also supposes that from their beginning they had been free from any false doctrine about the sacraments; for in his first chapter he speaks of their original: that it was from one Peter

<sup>1040.</sup> Waldensis (others call him Waldus), who in the time of (A. D. 1140.) Innocent the Second, (so he says, but others place him at <sup>1060.</sup> 1160,) which was the time of Alexander the Third,) reading that command of our Saviour to the rich young man, Matt. xix. 21, (some others also add, that he was also affrighted at the sudden death of one of his companions,) took a resolution of selling all he had, and giving it to the poor: and was imitated by some others, particularly one John of the city of Lyons. After a while they took on them to preach; and being forbid, (for they were laymen,) they refused to forbear, and so were excommunicated. Then they betook themselves to preaching privately; and, as he adds, 'out of hatred to the clergy and the true priesthood, they began out of the errors of old heretics, and adding some new and pernicious articles, to destroy, condemn, and reject all those means by which the clergy, as a good mother, do gather their children, except the *sacraments* only.'



He means, as appears by what follows, they rejected indulgences, pardons, canonical hours, prayers to the saints, &c. But if they had rejected infant-baptism, he would not have failed to have mentioned that. By which it appears, that either this man had never heard of the Petrobrusians, or else had not heard that they denied infant-baptism; or else did not take them to have been Waldenses.

And in this last mentioned sense Cassander<sup>o</sup> speaks of the Petrobrusians, as a sect that, together with the salvation of infants, denied their baptism: but of the Waldenses, as practising it.

The Petrobrusians could not properly be called Waldenses, because they set up their party before Waldus did his. For Peter Bruis had preached twenty years when Cluniacensis wrote, as I  
1026. (A. D. 1126.) shewed before: which was 1146. And Waldus  
1046. (A. D. 1146.) began, by the earliest account, in the time of  
1030. (A. D. 1130.) Pope Innocent the Second, whose first year was  
1130.

So if we take the name [Waldenses] strictly, for one sort of men, as those old writers generally do; then there is no account that any of them were antipædobaptists. But if we take it in that large sense as many late writers do, to include all the sorts that I have rehearsed, then there is probable evidence that one sort of them, viz. the Petrobrusians, were so; but not that the general body of the Waldenses were. And that opinion of the Petrobrusians seems to have been in a short time extinguished and forgotten.

VIII. Now because I take this Peter Bruis (or Bruce perhaps his name was) and Henry to be the first antipædobaptist preachers that ever set up a church or society of men holding that opinion against infant-baptism, and rebaptizing such as had been baptized in infancy; I will, for the sake of the antipædobaptists, give the history of them, so far as it is upon record. And the same thing may gratify the Quakers; for I believe they were the first likewise of all that have owned the Scriptures, (as I see no reason to conclude but this people did; though there was a report that they rejected some books of them,) that ever taught that the use of receiving the Lord's Supper is not to be continued.

They were both Frenchmen. Both of mean rank or quality: for Peter of Clugny<sup>p</sup> bespeaks them thus: 'Because the darkness of a

<sup>o</sup> De Baptismo Infantium. [In præfatione, pag. 671. Oper. Omn. fol. Paris. 1616.]

<sup>p</sup> [See the works of this author, Peter Mauritius, abbot of Clugny, fol. Paris,

1522: or, in the collection entitled, *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, fol. Paris, 1612: or, in vol. xii. part 2. of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Cologne edition, fol. 1618.]

mean condition kept you obscure, had you therefore a mind by some very wicked exploit to make yourselves to be taken notice of?' Yet they had been in priest's orders, and had each of them a place or employment in that office; but the benefices belonging to them were, it seems, but small. Because he says; 'If the places wherein you ministered as presbyters afforded you but little gain, would you therefore resolve to turn all into confusion and profaneness?' Peter had had a church or parish, but was turned out of it; and, as this writer insinuates, for some misdemeanour. Henry had been a monk, and had deserted the monastery. For so he adds; 'because one of you was for a reason (he knows why) turned out of the church which he had,' &c. 'The other throwing off the monk's habit, turning an apostate,' &c.

The places where Bruis first made a party and gained proselytes were in that country which is since called Dauphiné. For the book, which Peter of Clugny writes against them, is by way of a letter to three bishops, within whose dioceses this had happened: and the bishops were Eberdunensis, Diensis, and Wapiensis; the bishops of Embrun, Die, and Gap. In the preface (which was written some time after the book, and after Bruis was dead) there is added the archbishop of Arles in Provence. But it is said in the book, that the city of Arles itself was free from the infection; only some parts of his province had been drawn into this persuasion. It was in the mountainous and wild parts of the said dioceses that it first took footing: for so Cluniacensis writes: 'I should have thought that it had been those craggy Alps, and rocks covered with continual snow, that had bred that savage temper in the inhabitants; and that your land, being unlike to all other lands, had yielded a sort of people unlike to all others; but that I now perceive,' &c.

1026 The time that it began, he mentions to have been  
(A.D. 1126.) twenty years before. And at the time when the book  
1046.  
(A.D. 1146.) was writ, (which was 1146,) those foresaid dioceses were, he says, clear of it. By the care of the said bishops it had been rooted out there; but that the preachers, when expelled thence, had planted it in the plain countries of Provincia Narbonensis. And there, says he, 'the heresy which among you was but timorously whispered or buzzed about in deserts and little villages, does now boldly vent itself in great crowds of people and in populous towns.' And the places specified in the books are, the places about the

<sup>9</sup> Answer to their fourth Article.  
[Contra id quod dicunt, Missam nihil  
esse nec celebrari debere, pag. 228. G.]

apud t. xii. Bibl. Patr. ed. Colon. 1618.]  
<sup>1</sup> Prope initium Epistolæ. [p. 208. C.  
Bibl. Patr.]

mouth of the Rhone, the plain country about Tholouse, and particularly that city itself, and many places in the province of Gascoigne.

<sup>1044.</sup> About the year 1144, Bruis being then in the territory of (A.D. 1144.) St. Gyles', where he had made many proselytes, he was, by the zeal of the faithful people (so Cluniacensis calls it) taken, and in that city, according to the laws then, burnt to death. The time I compute thus: Cluniacensis had wrote that letter to the bishops aforesaid; but understanding that Bruis was put to death, and the doctrine expelled out of their dioceses, he suppressed the publishing of his letter; but hearing that Henry, whom he calls the heir of Bruis' wickedness, did still propagate it in several places, and that there was danger of its reviving where it seemed to be extinct, he <sup>1046.</sup> put a new preface to his work and published it; which (A.D. 1146.) was in the year 1146.

Of the morals of Peter Bruis this writer gives no account, save that he describes in how tumultuous and outrageous a way things were managed by him and his party, where they prevailed<sup>s</sup>; 'The people rebaptized; the churches profaned; the altars dug up; the crosses burnt; the priests scourged; monks imprisoned,' &c. And he tells how they would, on a Good-Friday to choose, get together a great pile of crosses which they had pulled down, and making a fire of them, would roast meat at it; on which they would make a feast, in defiance of the fast kept by Christians on that day.

As for Henry, after he had gone about preaching in many cities and provinces of France, he was on the year 1146 or 7 found in the said territory of the earl of St. Gyles', when St. Bernard and some bishops came to those parts to confute these new doctrines. And of him Bernard does give a character in his letter to that earl; and it is a very scurvy character for a preacher.

'The man,' says he, 'is a renegado, who, leaving off his habit of religion, (for he was a monk,) returned, as a dog to his vomit, to the filthiness of the flesh and the world: and being ashamed to stay where he was known, &c. he became a vagabond; and being in beggary, he made the gospel maintain him; (for he is a scholar;) and setting to sale the word of God, he preached for bread. What he got of the silly people, or of the good women, more than would find him victuals, he spent in gaming at dice, or some worse way; for this celebrated preacher, after the day's applause, was at night often found in bed with whores, and sometimes with married women. Inquire, if you please, noble sir, how he left the city Losanna, what sort of departure he made out of Mayne, and also

<sup>s</sup> Prope ab initio. [p. 208. A. *ibid.*]



‘from Poictou, and from Bordeaux: to none of which places he dares return, having left such a stink behind him.’ If any one shall think that in the credit one is to give to this description there ought to be some allowance made for the malice of his enemies, I have nothing to say against that.

He that writes the life of St. Bernard<sup>t</sup>, says, that upon this mission Henry fled, and lying hid for some time, but ‘nobody being willing to receive him, was at last taken and delivered chained to the bishop,’ (the bishop of Ostia, I suppose; who was a cardinal, and the chief man of the mission,) but what was done with him is not said. But of the people it is said, that ‘those who had erred were reduced, the wavering were satisfied, and the seducers so <sup>1048.</sup> ‘confuted that they durst no where appear.’ And a little <sup>(A. D. 1148.)</sup> after this, Bernard has a letter to the people of Tholouse<sup>u</sup>, congratulating their recovery from the confusions that had been among them on account of those opinions.

Their way of preaching against the other sacrament, of the Lord’s Supper, is thus represented by Cluniacensis<sup>x</sup>: ‘Your words, as near as I can learn them, are these: “Oh good people, do not believe your bishops, presbyters, and clergymen that seduce you. As they deceive you in many other things, so they do in the office of the altar; where they tell you this lie, that they do make the body of Christ, and give it you for the salvation of your souls. They lie notoriously. For the body of Christ was only once made by himself at the supper before his passion; and was once only, viz. at that time, given to his disciples. Since that time it was never made by any one, nor given to any one.”’

As the people of this way were from Peter Bruis commonly called Petrobrusians; so they were, from Henry, sometimes called Henricians.

## CHAP. VIII.

*Of the present state of the Controversy. That all the National Churches in the World are Pædobaptists. Of the Antipædobaptists that are in Germany, Holland, England, Poland, and Transylvania.*

I. ALL the opinions that had any great number of abettors in

<sup>t</sup> Gaufrid. lib. iii. chap. 5. [See the life of St. Bernard, in seven books, (three of which are by Gaufridus, his secretary, afterwards abbot of Clairvaux,) prefixed to the edition of Bernard’s works by Horstius, published at Lyons in folio, 1679, book iii. chap. 6. sect. 17. p. 34. In former editions only five books were

given, and the passage cited was found in chapter 5. (not 6.) as in the edit. of 1586: tom. ii. p. 828.]

<sup>u</sup> Ad Tolosan. Epist. 241. [apud Bernardi Op. tom. ii. p. 276. edit. 1586.]

<sup>x</sup> Ad Artic. 4tum. [apud Bibl. Patr. ut supra, p. 228. A.]

the ancient times, though they may have been condemned by general councils, yet have so continued or sprung up afresh, that they have in some country or other become the general opinion. So Nestorianism, Eutychianism, &c. have each of them found some place, in which to this day they do prevail as the national constitution.

As for antipædobaptism, whatever be judged of the proofs brought to shew that there have been some societies of men that have owned it, as the Petrobrusians lately mentioned, &c. there is no pretence that it has been, or is now, the opinion of any national church in the world. Wherever there are at present any Christians of that persuasion, they are as dissenters from the general body of Christians in that place. If this admit of any exception, it is in the country of Georgia, or Circassia: of which I shall speak presently.

This, for all Europe, is notorious. The papists do not only own infant-baptism, but do generally still hold that an infant dying unbaptized, though by misadventure, cannot come to the kingdom of heaven; but must go to the region of Hades, called *limbus infantum*. And they have scarce any antipædobaptists mixed among them in the countries where they have the government.

In many of the protestant or reformed countries there are some of this persuasion; in some more, in some fewer, and in some none at all: but in none of them has it prevailed to be the established religion. And though the contrary be not at all pretended, yet Mr. Walker has taken pains to prove this by reciting<sup>y</sup> their several confessions, wherein they own infant-baptism; and among the rest, that of the Waldenses or Vaudois assembled at Angrogne.

<sup>1435.</sup> The church of England is taken notice of by some to (A.D. 1535.) speak very moderately in this matter<sup>z</sup>: ‘The baptism of ‘ young children is in any wise to be retained in the church, as ‘ most agreeable with the institution of Christ.’ Yet they own, as I shewed before<sup>a</sup>, the ‘necessity of this sacrament where it may ‘ be had.’ And they do not think fit to use the office of burial (in which the deceased is styled a brother) for infants that die without it.

The Greek Christians also of Constantinople, and other parts of Europe under the Turk’s dominion, are known to baptize infants. Sir Paul Ricaut, among others, has given a full account<sup>b</sup> of their

<sup>y</sup> Modest Plea, ch. xxvii. [sect. 5 and 6.  
p. 226—228.]

<sup>z</sup> Article 27.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. vi. § 8.

<sup>b</sup> Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches, ch. vii. [p. 161. 8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1679.]

manner of doing it; and wherein they differ from the ceremonies of the Latins.

The same may be said of the Muscovites; who were from their first conversion a part of the Greek church, but do of late choose a patriarch of their own. Of their practice in this matter for the last centuries, Mr. Walker has recited evidences in the chapter aforesaid; and for their present practice every one knows it. They are said formerly to have baptized none before the fortieth day, except in case of necessity; but Dr. Crull, who has wrote latest of them, says<sup>c</sup>, that now 'they baptize their children as soon as they 'are born.'

II. In all the countries of Asia, the government is either Mahometan or Pagan. Yet in many of them, and especially of those under the Turks, the greatest part of the people are still Christian: there are also many Christians in several of the countries that are under the Persian government; and some in those of the Mogul. These have all continued now a long time under persecution and daily hardships, and in great wants of the means of instruction; yet have kept most of the main articles of the Christian religion. They are some of them Nestorians, as those who acknowledge the patriarch of Mosul; some Eutychians, as the Jacobites, the Maronites, (and the Armenians, as most say; but sir Paul Ricaut judges otherwise of them). An account of their several tenets is given by Brerewood, in his *Inquiries*, Heylyn in his *Cosmography*, &c. They do all hold and practise infant-baptism.

Col. Danvers says<sup>d</sup>, that 'the Armenians are confessed by Heylyn, 'Microcosm, p. 573, to defer baptism of children till they be of 'grown years.' Heylyn in his youth wrote a short tract of geography, called *Microcosme*<sup>e</sup>; and afterward living to a more mature age, he wrote a large volume on the same subject, called *Cosmography*; wherein he added a great many particulars concerning each nation, that were not in the former piece: also several things he altered and amended upon better information; and he left out such things as he had not found to be confirmed. Now in that former piece he had divided Armenia into three parts: 1. That which is

<sup>c</sup> Present State of Muscovy, vol. i. cap. 11. [p. 192.]

<sup>d</sup> Treatise, part i. ch. 7. cent. 16. [p. 81.]

<sup>e</sup> [Dr. Heylyn's first piece came out under the title of 'Microcosmus, a Little 'Description of the Great World.' This appeared first in 1621, again in 1624.

Third edition, in which he acknowledges the errors and defects of the former two, in 1627.

In 1665 the enlarged work was published, entitled 'Cosmography, in Four 'Books,' &c. folio, being the fourth edition. The fifth in 1677.



properly so called; 2. Georgia; 3. Mengrelia: and of the Christians of Armenia properly so called, had said, that one of the things in which they differ from the western Christians is, ‘in receiving infants to the Lord’s table presently after their baptism.’ Which he also confirms in the later book<sup>f</sup>. Of the Georgians, [Colchians,] he had indeed said in that former piece, that ‘they baptize not their children till eight years old.’ But in the later and larger tract says no such thing: but, on the contrary, says, ‘they are agreeable in doctrinal points to the church of Greece, whose rituals also the people do to this day follow: not subject for all that to the patriarch of Constantinople, (though of his communion,) but to their own metropolitan onlys.’

For what he had said of them in his former piece, ‘that they baptize not till the eighth year,’ he had quoted in the margin Brerewood. But Brerewood, in the edition that I have, (London, 1622<sup>h</sup>.) does not say this of the Georgians: but making one chapter (chap. xvii.) of the Georgians, Circassians, and Mengrelians; (whom he makes three several people all bordering together;) of the Georgians says the same that Heylyn does in his later book, viz. that they are conformable to the Greeks: but says, that ‘the Circassians baptize not their children till the eighth year, and enter not into the church (the gentlemen especially) till the sixtieth (or as others say, till the fortieth) year, but hear divine service standing without the temple; that is to say, till through age they grow unable to continue their rapines and robberies, to which sin that nation is exceedingly addicted: so dividing their life betwixt sin and devotion, dedicating their youth to rapine, and their old age to repentance.’

Concerning these Georgians and Mengrelians, [or Circassians,] I shall speak more particularly presently. But for the Armenians; both Brerewood in his inquiries<sup>i</sup>, and Heylyn, as I quoted before, and all others, do agree that they constantly baptize infants. And if the reader need any larger satisfaction, he may have it from sir Paul Ricaut, who writes distinctly of them, not from remote report, but from the converse he had with them: for many of this people do frequent Smyrna, Constantinople, &c. He gives<sup>k</sup> a full account of their baptism of infants; and that ‘they esteem it necessary, as being that which washes away ori-

<sup>f</sup> Lib. iii. in Turcomania. [p. 125. edit. 1676.]

<sup>g</sup> [Ibid. p. 130.]

<sup>h</sup> [It is exactly the same in the earlier edition of 1614.]

<sup>i</sup> Cap. 24. [p. 173. in edit. 1614 and 1622.]

<sup>k</sup> Present State of the Armenian Church, cap. 8. [p. 432.]

‘ginal sin.’ And also, that (as Heylyn and Brerewood had said) ‘they administer to the child after it the holy eucharist, which ‘they do only by rubbing the lips with it.’

The Maronites give baptism to infants with this particularity<sup>l</sup>, that they baptize not a male child till he be forty days old, nor a female till eighty days: which is the time limited, Levit. xii. for the purification of the mother. Also they, as well as the Armenians, give the eucharist to infants presently after their baptism.

Of all these sorts of Christians the western part of the world has all along had some knowledge and account: but it is otherwise of those in India, called the Christians of St. Thomas, inhabiting about Cochin, Cranganor, and all that vast tract or promontory, lying between the coast of Malabar and the coast of Coromandel. These were utterly unknown, and not heard of by

<sup>1400.</sup> us of the West for a thousand years and more, viz. till (A. D. 1500.) about the year 1500, when those parts were discovered by the Portuguese. There were then estimated to be fifteen or sixteen thousand families of them, living among the heathens, to whom they were subject. They were found in the practice of infant-baptism; but they did not administer it till the child were forty days old, except in the case of danger of death. An account of the state of religion in which they were found, and of this among the rest, is given by Hieronymus Osorius ‘de rebus gestis

<sup>1500.</sup> ‘Emanuelism.’ And of the methods by which they (A. D. 1600.) were, one hundred years after, brought over to a communion with the church of Rome, by Mr. Geddes<sup>n</sup>, in his Account of the Synod of Diamper. The practice of these Indian Christians may convince our antipædobaptists of their mistake in thinking that infant-baptism began in the known parts of the world but of late years: for how then should it have been communicated to these men, who had never heard of such a part of the world as Europe?

In short, there can be no question made of the practice of any Christians in Asia as to this matter; unless it be of those I mentioned before, that inhabit the countries of Georgia and Mengrelia [or Circassia]. And therefore I will be a little more particular about them.

<sup>l</sup> Heylyn, Cosmograph. Syria. [Book iii. p. 40. edit. 1676.]

<sup>m</sup> Lib. iii. prope finem. [H. Osorii de rebus gestis Emanuelis regis Lusitaniæ, libri sex. 8o. Colon. 1574. iterum 1576.]

<sup>n</sup> See ‘The History of the Church of Malabar: together with the Synod of Diamper, celebrated A. D. 1599: by Michael Geddes.’ 8vo. London, 1694.]

Georgia was formerly called Iberia, and Mengrelia [or Circassia] was called Colchis. They bordered together, lying in the remote part of Asia, between the Euxine and Caspian sea; and are in religion much the same.

It is to be noted that these people were converted to the  
<sup>230.</sup>  
 (A.D. 330.) Christian faith in the time of Constantine, by the means of a Christian servant maid; much after the same manner as Naaman the Syrian was to the knowledge of God. The maid by prayer to Christ cured the queen of Iberia of a sickness: this and some other evidences converted the king; and he sent messengers to Constantine to desire some preachers to be sent to instruct the people, which was readily granted: and the nation became Christian. This is related by authors that lived about that time, such as Rufinus<sup>o</sup>, Socrates<sup>p</sup>, &c.

<sup>300.</sup>  
 (A.D. 400.) And as they received the faith from that church under Constantine, so they are recorded in the succeeding  
<sup>340.</sup>  
 (A.D. 440.) times to have held communion with the same, viz. the Greek church. And how that church (as well before their division from the Latins, as since) managed in the matter of baptism, has been already shewn. In after-times the Saracens, and then the Turks, possessing those parts of Asia that lie between the Greeks and them, must needs break off the correspondence in great measure: and they themselves, as well as the Greeks, have been since conquered by the Mahometans. Yet they have and do still keep up some face of Christianity, though in great ignorance. And the generality of late historians and geographers do still speak of them as conformable to the Greek church, so far as they practise any Christian worship at all: as I shewed even now that Heylyn in his last book does.

But sir Paul Ricaut, who was consul at Smyrna, and travelled  
<sup>1577.</sup>  
 (A.D. 1677.) in some other parts of the Levant about the year 1677, heard the same report of them that Brerewood and Heylyn at first heard; Heylyn of the Georgians, and Brerewood (as he distinguishes them) of the Circassians. Sir Paul Ricaut's words are these<sup>q</sup>:

‘The Georgians, which in some manner depend on the Greek church, baptize not their children until they be eight years of age. They formerly did not admit them to baptism until fourteen: but by means of such preachers as the patriarch of Antioch sends amongst them yearly, they were taught how necessary it

<sup>o</sup> Hist. Eccles. lib. x. cap. 11.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. lib. i. cap. 20.

<sup>q</sup> Present State of the Greek Church, cap. 7. [page 169.]



‘ was to baptize infants ; and how agreeable it was to the practice  
 ‘ of the ancient church. But these being a people very tenacious  
 ‘ of the doctrines they once received, could hardly be persuaded  
 ‘ out of this error : till at length, being wearied with the impor-  
 ‘ tunate arguments of the Greeks, they consented as it were to a  
 ‘ middle way, and so came down from fourteen to eight years of  
 ‘ age ; and cannot as yet be persuaded to a nearer compliance.’

When I read this first, I thought that we had at last found a church of antipædobaptists (though a great way off), and that a national one, as far as it may be so called in a nation mostly Christians, though under Mahometan government. For the words, as they are placed, do intimate that this people keep off children from baptism by their principle ; and that, as is represented, of a long standing.

But as sir Paul Ricaut could have this only by report, and that from a country very remote from the places where he travelled, and very unfrequented : so it happened that sir John Chardin was actually<sup>r</sup> travelling in those countries of Georgia and Mengrelia about the same time : and also was acquainted there with  
 1577. a missionary, called F. Joseph Maria Zampi, who had  
 (A. D. 1677.) lived there twenty-three years, who shewed him a manuscript account drawn up by himself, of the observations he had made concerning the religion of the Mengrelians and Georgians ; which account, sir John says, was perfectly agreeable to all that he himself observed there.

Now sir John, and the said missionary both, do observe, that these people do indeed many of them put off the baptizing of their children for a great while : and that many of the people there are never baptized at all. But they speak of this, not as a principle or tenet of theirs, that so it ought to be done : but as proceeding from a wretched neglect and stupid carelessness, which they shew in that and in all other points of the Christian religion. Christianity is there, as it seems, almost extinguished : and whoever reads the book, sees the most deplorable face of a church that is in the world. It may be necessary to recite some passages of the book, and of the manuscript there exhibited.

Sir John Chardin himself says<sup>s</sup>, ‘ Their religion was, I believe, ‘ formerly the same with that of the Greeks.’ But for the pre-

<sup>r</sup> Voyage into Persia, p. 86. [See Travels of Sir John Chardin into Persia and the East-Indies, through the Black Sea and the country of Colchis, folio, London, 1689, p. 77, &c. Dr. Wall appears to

have used some other edition ; and his quotations, though the same in sense, are not given in the exact words found in that above mentioned.]

<sup>s</sup> Page 85. [93. edit. 1686.]

sent state of it, says; 'I could never discover any religion in any Mengrelian; having not found any that know what religion, or law, or sin, or a sacrament, or divine service is.'

The MS. says<sup>†</sup>, 'This people have not the least idea of faith or religion. The most of them take eternal life, the universal judgment, the resurrection of the dead, for fables.' And a little after<sup>u</sup>, 'God only knows the deplorable estate of these wretched priests, or the validity of their priesthood. For it is always uncertain whether they are baptized; and whether the bishops that have ordained them have been consecrated or baptized themselves.'

And of their baptism, gives this account<sup>x</sup>:

'They anoint infants as soon as they are born, on the forehead. The oil for this anointing is called *myrone*. The baptism is not administered till a long time after. No man baptizes his child till he has means [or unless he have ability, *s'il n'a moyen*] to make a feast at the christening. Hence it comes to pass that many infants die without receiving it.

'When they administer it to any infant, they do not carry it to the church: but in a common room the priest, without putting on any priestly habit, sits him down, and reads a long time in a book. After a long reading, the godfather undresses the infant, and washes him all over with water: and then rubs him over with the *myrone* which the priest gives him. This done, they clothe the infant again, and give him something to eat,' &c.

'There is not one priest among them that understands the *form of baptism*: so that there is no question but their baptism is utterly invalid. On this regard the fathers Theatins baptize as many infants as they can. They give them baptism under pretence of applying some medicine to them,' &c.

Sir John himself, at another place in his book, tells how the Romish priests that are there, do this. A priest that is called to see a sick child, calls for a bason of water, as it were to wash his hands: then before his hands be dry, he touches the forehead of the child with a wet finger, as if he observed something concerning his distemper: or by shaking his hand causes some drops of water to fly in the face of a child that stands by, as it were in sport; saying the form of baptism either mentally or with a muttering voice. One would think this as defective a sort of baptizing as that of the ignorant native priests.

Sir John was invited to two christenings there. He went,

<sup>†</sup> Page 86. [94.]

<sup>u</sup> Page 89. [97.]

<sup>x</sup> Page 93. [101.]

that he might see the fashion of it. He gives an account of one of them. It was much after the manner related in the manuscript. The priest read, but talked at the same time to those that came in and out. The people went irreverently to and fro in the room; and so did the boy that was to be baptized, chewing a piece of pig the while. ‘He was,’ he says, ‘a little boy of five years old.’

It is to be noted that the manuscript gives this as the common account of the rites both of the Mengrelians and Georgians. And so sir John himself, when he comes to the Georgians, has only this of their religion. ‘The belief of the Georgians is much the same with that of the Mengrelians. The one and the other received it at the same time; viz. in the fourth century: and by the same means, of a woman of Iberia that had been a Christian at Constantinople. In a word, the one as well as the other have lost all the spirit of Christianity: and what I said of the Mengrelians (that they have nothing of Christianity but the name, and that they neither observe nor hardly know any precept of the law of Jesus Christ) is no less true of the people of Georgia<sup>z</sup>.’

This state of the matter, as it is different from what sir Paul Ricaut gives, (for this people do baptize infants when they think of it, and when they have got their good cheer ready,) so it might give occasion to the report which he, and Heylyn formerly, had heard. For it is probable the patriarch of Antioch might send to them to be more diligent in baptizing their infants. But the arguments that this people needed to persuade them to it, were not such as are used to antipædobaptists, but such as we should use to Christians that are falling back into heathenism, or total irreligion.

III. In Africa there are but two sorts of Christians: the Cophti of Ægypt, who are the remains of the old Christian church there; and the Abassens. Both of these baptize their infants, as is clear by accounts given of them by all historians and travellers. Brerewood<sup>a</sup>, Heylyn<sup>b</sup>, and others, speak of their particular observations about it. The Cophti baptize none till he be forty days old, though he die in the interim. The Abassens (as we said before of the Maronites in Asia) baptize the male children at forty days, and the female at eighty days, after their circumcision; for they circumcise their children of both sexes.

<sup>y</sup> Page 140. [p. 154.]

<sup>a</sup> Inquiries, ch. 22, 23.

<sup>z</sup> Page 206. [p. 192.]

<sup>b</sup> *Cosmographia, Ægypt, and Æthiopia Superior.*



But these last do in the case of peril of death baptize sooner. They do both give the eucharist to infants after baptism.

But here also a mistake in a late book of travels needs to be rectified. Mr. Thevenot tells in his account of *Ægypte*, that while he was at Grand Cairo, he had some conference with an ambassador that was there from the Abassens' country, about the religion and other affairs of those parts. This ambassador told him, that the Abassens circumcise their children 'at eight days old, 'as the Jews; and fifteen days after, baptize them. Before that 'the Jesuits came thither, they did not baptize them till thirty 'or forty years.'

Whoever reads what all other historians say of this people, viz. that they baptized forty days after circumcision, will easily observe that Monsieur Thevenot has here mistaken in the last word of the sentence, years for days. Either he misheard the ambassador, or else mistook in setting it down: or else the French printer mistook it, for it is so in the French<sup>d</sup>, as well as in the translation of the book into English. There are a great many of those eastern Christians that put off the baptism forty *days*: but if any had delayed baptism till forty *years*, (to which age half of mankind does never arrive,) we should have heard more of it than from that hour's conference.

IV. This is the account of the practice of the national churches. But though there be no national church but what baptizes infants; yet there are, and have been for about one hundred and eighty years last past, in several countries of Europe, considerable numbers of men, that differ from the established churches in this point. The history of their beginning and progress in Germany is so well known, and so much talked of, that I shall say the less of it. It is in short this:

<sup>1417.</sup> No sooner had the reformation begun by Luther, (A. D. 1517.) anno 1517, taken good footing in Saxony, and some other parts of Germany, great numbers of people and some princes (who were at this time generally weary of the abuses and corruptions of popery, and longed for a reformation) greedily em-

<sup>1422.</sup> bracing it, but that within five or six years there arose (A. D. 1522.) a sort of men that pretended to refine upon him. One Nicolas Storek, and Thomas Munzer, seconded within a while by one Baltazar Hobmeier, preached that the baptism of infants was also an abuse that must be reformed; and they baptized over again

<sup>c</sup> Travels, tom. i. part 2. ch. 69, [p. 238. edit. fol. London, 1687.]

<sup>d</sup> [Printed in four volumes folio, at Paris, 1683.]

such as became their disciples. They added also other things; that it was not fit, nor to be endured in the kingdom of Jesus Christ, that some should be so rich, and others so poor; or that the boors should be held to such burdensome services by their landlords. Abundance of people flocked to them. And the more, for that there had been before discontents, and some insurrections, and of those poorer sort of people, because of their foresaid hardships.

There was this difference between Luther's method and theirs; that he and his partners preached up obedience to all lawful magistrates in temporal things; but they carried things with a higher hand, in defiance of magistracy; and Munzer called himself *The sword of the Lord, and of Gideon*<sup>e</sup>.

1425. Luther and the protestants entered their protestation (A.D. 1525.) against their proceedings, as bringing a scandal on the new-begun reformation; but they went on, and after some time (great numbers of disorderly people joining with them) became masterless, made a sort of army, committed great ravages on the

1434. estates of rich men, where they marched. And at last, (A.D. 1534.) anno 1534, a strong party of this sort of men coming mostly from Holland, seized on the city of Munster, where one John Becold, called John of Leyden, being advanced to be their king, they pretended to prophecy and revelation; and did under the name of Christ's kingdom practise several tyrannies and enormities, as polygamy, plundering, &c.

Some regular forces being brought against them, they were subdued: and the king and some of the heads of them being put to death, the rest were dispersed into several parts of Germany; and a great many of them fled into the Low Countries, where there were already great numbers of them.

The antipædobaptists, that are now, do not love to hear of these men, nor do own them as predecessors; neither is there any reason that their miscarriages should be imputed to them, provided that they renounce and keep themselves from all such seditious practices: especially since many of the people professing that opinion did a little after separate themselves from the tumultuous rabble, and made a declaration of better principles under better leaders, as I shall shew by and by. Almost all alterations in religion, either for better or worse, have at the beginning some disorders. It is happy where magistrates, pastors, and people, do all at one time agree and conspire in any reformation that is thought necessary: but it is seldom known.

That which is more material to the history of infant-baptism, is to inquire whether this Storeck, Munzer, Hobmeier, &c., did at <sup>1422.</sup> that time, viz. anno 1522, set up this tenet as a thing (A.D. 1522.) then new or newly revived; or whether it had been continued and handed down by some dispersed people, from the <sup>1050.</sup> times of the Petrobrusians (of whom I spoke in the last (A.D. 1150.) chapter, § 5) to this time. Danvers says<sup>f</sup>, that ‘the present Belgic anabaptists do with one mouth assert and maintain the latter.’ The chief reason he brings either of his own or of theirs is, because it appears that there were great numbers of them in several parts of Germany in Luther’s time; and that <sup>1422.</sup> (A.D. 1522.) he and others of the first protestants had <sup>1425.</sup> (A.D. 1525.) disputations with them in Saxony, Thuringia, <sup>1429.</sup> (A.D. 1529.) Switzerland, &c., ‘whereby it is evident that they had a being in those parts before Luther’s time; for it cannot rationally be supposed that they should all of a sudden be spread over so great a territory as the Upper Germany.’

But of the sudden increase both of the protestants and of these men, I gave some account before. He brings also some authorities. But they are out of books of no credit for any thing before their own time: Dutch Martyrology, Frank, Twisk, Merning, &c. If there were any continuation of the doctrine for the said two or three hundred years, it must have been very obscure, and by a very few men, because there is in all that interval no mention of them in any good author. The only authority that I remember <sup>1160.</sup> (A.D. 1160.) to have read after 1260, and before 1522, which <sup>1422.</sup> (A.D. 1522.) may seem to make any thing to the purpose of antipædobaptism, is a letter written to Erasmus out of Bohemia <sup>1419.</sup> by one Joannes Slechta Costelecicus, dated October 10th, (A.D. 1519.) 1519; a part whereof is published by Colomesius in his Collection of Letters of Men of Note, Epistle 30g. This letter, as it is dated three years before Storeck and the rest are said to have begun, so it speaks of a sect that had been then in being in that country for some time. I will recite that part of the letter entire, because, though it be not all to this purpose, yet it is all worth the reading, that we may see what schemes of doctrine were abroad in the world a little before Luther began to oppose the church of Rome.

‘The third sect is of those whom they call Pyghards: they

<sup>f</sup> Treatise, part ii. ch. 7. page 257. edit. 2. 1674.

edition of *Clemens Romanus*, published by Colomesius, 12<sup>o</sup>. London, 1687.]

<sup>g</sup> [This Collection is subjoined to an



‘ have their name from a certain refugee of the same nation, who  
 ‘ came hither ninety-seven years ago, when that wicked and  
 1320. ‘ sacrilegious John Zizka declared a defiance of the church-  
 (A.D. 1420.) ‘ men and all the clergy.’ (This was 1420.)

‘ These men have no other opinion of the pope, cardinals,  
 ‘ bishops, and other clergy, than as of manifest Antichrists: they  
 ‘ call the pope sometimes *the beast*, and sometimes *the whore*, men-  
 ‘ tioned in the Revelations. Their own bishops and priests they  
 ‘ themselves do choose for themselves, ignorant and unlearned  
 ‘ laymen that have wives and children. They mutually salute one  
 ‘ another by the name of brother and sister.

‘ They own no other authority than the Scriptures of the Old  
 ‘ and New Testament. They slight all the doctors both ancient  
 ‘ and modern, and give no regard to their doctrine.

‘ Their priests, when they celebrate the offices of the mass, [or  
 ‘ communion,] do it without any priestly garments: nor do they  
 ‘ use any prayer or collects on this occasion, but only the Lord’s  
 ‘ Prayer; by which they consecrate bread that has been leavened.

‘ They believe or own little or nothing of the sacraments of  
 ‘ the church. Such as come over to their sect must every one be  
 ‘ *baptized anew* in mere water. They make no blessing of salt nor  
 ‘ of the water; nor make any use of consecrated oil.

‘ They believe nothing of divinity in the sacrament of the  
 ‘ Eucharist; only that the consecrated bread and wine do by some  
 ‘ occult signs represent the death of Christ: and accordingly, that  
 ‘ all that do kneel down to it or worship it, are guilty of idolatry.  
 ‘ That that sacrament was instituted by Christ to no other purpose  
 ‘ but to renew the memory of his passion, and not to be carried  
 ‘ about or held up by the priest to be gazed on. For that Christ  
 ‘ himself, who is to be adored and worshipped with the honour of  
 ‘ *latría*, sits at the right hand of God, as the Christian church  
 ‘ confesses in the Creed.

‘ Prayers of the saints and for the dead they count a vain and  
 ‘ ridiculous thing: as likewise auricular confession, and penance  
 ‘ enjoined by the priest for sins. Eves and fast days are, they  
 ‘ say, a mockery, and the disguise of hypocrites.

‘ They say, the holydays of the Virgin Mary, and the apostles  
 ‘ and other saints, are the invention of idle people. But yet they  
 1419. ‘ keep the Lord’s day, and Christmas, and Easter, and  
 (A.D. 1519.) ‘ Whitsuntide,’ &c. He says there were great numbers of  
 this sect then in Bohemia.

Where it is here said that they rebaptized, it is not certain

whether they did it as judging baptism in infancy invalid, or as judging all baptism received in the corrupt way of the church of Rome to be so. The coherence of the words seems to incline to the latter. And Ottius, Hist. Anabapt.<sup>h</sup> anno 1521, affirms the latter to be true.

There is, I think, no doubt but these Pyghards were the same that Æneas Sylvius gives an account of in his *Historia Bohemica*<sup>i</sup> written sixty years before, and calls Picards. He in that history says nothing of their denying infants' baptism, as I observed in the last chapter § 6. Baltazar Lydius<sup>k</sup> and Burigenus do both of them recite the confessions of these men, offered by themselves to  
<sup>1408.</sup> king Uladislus, in which they expressly own it. John  
 (A.D. 1508.) Huss, whose doctrine these men followed, is never said to  
<sup>1315.</sup>  
 (A.D. 1415.) have denied it: only he is accused to have consented to that opinion of Wickliffe<sup>l</sup>, that a child that misses of baptism may possibly be saved.

These Pyghards do in their confessions say, that they are falsely called Waldenses. I am apt to think they had this name of Picards, or Pyghards, from the old Beghards, which was one of the sects that we do now comprehend under the name Waldenses, though the Waldenses, so called by Pilichdorf, did, as he says<sup>m</sup>, abominate the Beghards. One of the authors in Gretzer's<sup>n</sup> collection of writers against the Waldenses, called *Conradus de monte puellarum*, says, that this sect was then rife in all Germany, and that 'the men of it were called Beghards, and the women Begines:' but has nothing about their baptism. And I have heard that there are now popish monasteries in Flanders of men called Beghards, and women Beguines. I know not what signification that name may have in any language that can make it applicable to such different constitutions (for the old Beghards did, as all the rest whom we call Waldenses, abominate the church of Rome), unless it signify the same as our English word *beggar*: and so they should have their

<sup>h</sup> [Jo. H. Ottii *Annales Anabaptistici*, 4to. Basilee, 1672.]

<sup>i</sup> [This piece is found in the collections entitled, '*Historiæ Bohemicæ Scriptores*,' published by Dubravius, by Freherus, &c. also in vol. i. of the '*Waldensia*' of B. Lydius, 12<sup>o</sup>. 1616.]

<sup>k</sup> [See the collection entitled, '*Waldensia, id est Conservatio veræ Ecclesiæ demonstrata ex confessionibus, cum Tabularum ante CC. fere annos, tum Bohemorum, circa tempora Reformationis scriptis*. Studio et opera Baltha-

'sar Lydii, Ecclesiastæ apud Durdrech-tanos.' 2. tom. 12<sup>o</sup>. Roterodami et Dordraci, 1616 et 1617. In the first volume occurs the Confession alluded to in the text; and likewise a Defence of it, translated out of Bohemian by Burigenus, Doctor de Kornis. See the second part of that volume, page 1, &c. and again, p. 92, &c.]

<sup>l</sup> Foxe Martyrology, John Huss, 1415.

<sup>m</sup> See ch. vii. § 7.

<sup>n</sup> [See above, chap. vii. p. 483. n.]

name from their poverty, as some sorts both of the friars and also of the Waldenses had. The council of Vienna under Clement V. condemns a sort of people then in Germany, the men called Beghards, the women Begines, as holding certain distracted opinions there recited, much the same as the wildest of our Quakers and enthusiasts. The council says nothing of their denying infant-baptism, but yet they pass a decree in confirmation of it.

I said that the antipædobaptists, dispersed from Munster, fled some into several principalities of the Upper Germany, and some into the Low Countries. They that continued in Germany found but cold entertainment; partly because of their new doctrines, and partly because of the disorders they had committed during that short time of their reign. The papists generally reproached the protestants, that they were a sect sprung from them, and would call all protestants, in scorn, anabaptists; but the protestants disowned them, and wrote against them. And Sleidan gives several instances wherein the protestant princes and states declared against harbouring them; and made answer to the reproaches of the papists, that they took more care to rid their countries of them than they themselves did. And there are said to be very few of them now in either the popish or the protestant countries of the Upper Germany.

Those of them that retired into the Belgic provinces found there more partisans than any where else. At Amsterdam particularly they were near acting the same tragedy they had done at Munster. One John Geles, sent out of Munster by John of Leyden to get supplies of men, and to stir up other cities, had formed a design to surprise Amsterdam, May 12th, 1535. Which, by his numbers in the town, and some from other places, he was like to have effected. But they were defeated and killed. Also one John Matthew set up for a chief, and chose to himself twelve apostles; and found a great many disciples to his doctrine. They prophesied that the end of the world would be within a year: and filled people's heads with many other enthusiastical notions. Being suppressed by the magistrates, and some of them put to death, they are said to have endured it with great constancy.

<sup>1436.</sup> Cassander mentions also<sup>o</sup> one John Batenburg, who (A. D. 1536.) after the ceasing of the sedition of Munster began another. There were several other disturbances of less moment, which I pass by.

<sup>o</sup> Prefat. ad Ducem Clivie. [prefixed to Cassander's treatise 'Testimonia de Baptismo Infantium,' page 672 of his works, fol. Paris, 1616.



But Cassander and all agree, that a little while after this, one Menno, a countryman of Friesland, a man of a sober and quiet temper, that held the doctrine of antipædobaptism, did disclaim and protest against the seditious doctrines and practices of those at Munster and of Batenburg: and taught that *the kingdom of Jesus Christ*, which they had pretended to set up by external force, consisted in patience, meekness, and suffering quietly, if occasion should be. That one Theodoric succeeded this Menno in the same doctrine.

<sup>1460.</sup> And Cassander says, that in his time, which was about (A. D. 1560.) 140 years ago, ‘almost all that continued the profession of ‘that opinion in the Belgic provinces, were followers of this Menno.’ And so to this day they generally call themselves Mennonists, or, by abbreviation, Minnists.

He gives them this character: ‘Most of them do shew signs of a ‘pious disposition; and it seems to be rather by mistake than by ‘any wilful wickedness, that they, carried by an unskilful zeal, have ‘departed from the true sense of the Scripture and the uniform ‘agreement of the whole church.’ And says, ‘that they seem ‘worthy rather of pity and due information, than of persecution, or ‘being undone.’

One thing he says<sup>p</sup> of this Menno that is particular, viz. ‘That ‘whereas the credit of antiquity and perpetual tradition carries ‘great authority with it, even with those that set up new doctrines,’ &c.—And accordingly ‘some of these men had first endeavoured ‘to fix the origin of infant-baptism upon some pope of Rome: ‘Menno had more sense [or was more wary, *prudential*] than so. ‘He was forced to own that it had been in use from the apostles’ ‘time. But he said that the false apostles were the authors ‘of it.’

Cassander does there confute this notion with so good reasons, that I wonder he should call it a more wary one than the other. For as it had been indeed an unwary thing in Menno to deny that the baptizing of infants was in use in the ages next the apostles; when he might, for aught he knew, be convicted of falsehood by the remaining acts and records of those times: so to maintain that all the books that were preserved by the church were such as were written by the followers of the false apostles, and none by the followers of the true, is an imagination rather more absurd than the other. There were false apostles indeed, but they set themselves to slander, and speak and write against the true ones, as appears by

<sup>p</sup> Præfat. ad Testimonia contra Anabaptistas, [being a second preface to the before-named treatise, p. 675. *ibid.*]

what St. Paul and St. John do say of them. But the books and writings which the church has preserved are of such as do own the authority of the apostles.

1599.  
(A. D. 1699.) As for the present state of the Minnists, a late writer of those parts, an extract of whose book is given by Mr. Boval<sup>q</sup>, says, ‘Except Holland, where they live peaceably, they are ‘almost extinct.’ By Holland, I suppose he means the united provinces.

In those provinces there are considerable numbers of them, especially in Holland and Friezeland. They have the repute of being very fair traders and very sober men. They use a plainness in their garb to some degree of affectation, as the Quakers in England do. And they hold opinions something like theirs, against the lawfulness of oaths, of war, &c.

The other tenets attributed to them are<sup>r</sup>; That there is no original sin. That only the New Testament is a rule of faith. That Christ had his flesh, not of the Virgin Mary, but from heaven. That it is possible to live without sin in this life. That departed souls sleep till the resurrection, &c.

But some that have lived in that country say, that all these opinions are not common to them all: but that some churches of them hold some of these opinions, and other churches others of them. For their general humour is to divide into several churches on the least difference of opinions. Those of the old Flemish way keep a very strict discipline, and excommunicate people on very nice occasions: the Friezelanders receive all. Some of them allow of no baptism but by immersion, or putting the baptized person into the water; but the most part of them admit of baptism by affusion of water. In short, every congregation of them almost does espouse some particular tenets, only they do all of them renounce infant-baptism.

One cannot impute this, as any peculiar fault or folly, to the Minnists, that they are apt to divide and separate from one another on any small differences of opinion. It is a humour too general, and prevailing among many other people of that country, (as well as of ours,) to think that they ought to separate from all that hold any thing in religion different from what they themselves hold. Whereas the great aim and interest of religion is unity and communion in the worship of God, notwithstanding different sentiments in

<sup>q</sup> History of the works of the learned, July 1699.

<sup>r</sup> Stoup, Religion of the Hollanders.

[See ‘*La Religion des Hollandois*,’ 12mo. 1673. lettre 3. p. 49, 50, 51.]

points not fundamental; and schisms and parties are forbidden, as courses that will certainly ruin it: there is no sin that such people think to be a less sin than schism is. The papists do upbraid the protestants in general with this humour; as if it were the natural principle, and the millstone on the neck of protestantism. It is too true, that the protestant religion and interest has been much impaired by it in many countries; where it has grown and increased, in spite of the best endeavours of the ministers in shewing and declaring to the people the sinfulness of it. About which the papists, of all men, should make no noise, because they are the only men that get ground by it: they, and some few designing persons, who propose an interest by heading of parties. But they cannot say that this is true of *all*. There are some protestant countries so happy, as to keep their people in great union and uniformity.

But some of the Minnists do differ from the rest, and from all catholic Christians, in points more material, and such as are indeed <sup>1558.</sup> inconsistent with communion. For about the year 1658, (A. D. 1658.) the Socinians, that were grown to a considerable number in Poland, were expelled thence. Many of them sought a refuge in these parts. They had most of them added the opinion of antipædobaptism to what Socinus had taught them against our Saviour's divinity: and the common name by which they had in Poland been called was anabaptists. So when they came to Holland, they essayed mostly to strike in with the Minnists; and they have since brought over many of them to their opinion concerning the nature of Christ. One sort of the Minnists, called collegians, are generally Socinians, believing in nothing but the human nature of Jesus Christ, and holding it unlawful to pray to him; wherein they surpass the impiety of Socinus himself. These hold a general assembly twice a year at Rhinsburg: where it is said they observe this order, that he that comes first distributes the communion to all the assistants: for they have no regard to the ordination of ministers.

Others of the Minnists are Arians: of which opinion one Galenus<sup>s</sup>, now living in Amsterdam, is said to be the chief patron. And so these are by some called Galenists.

And generally speaking, the Minnists, though they do not all profess these opinions derogatory to our Saviour's divinity, yet do refuse the use of the words Trinity, Person, &c. and such other words concerning the nature of God, as are not in Scripture, but are used by the church to express the sense thereof.

The first Socinians that were in Holland (for there were some

<sup>s</sup> [Galenus Abrahamides de Haan.]



few before the year I spoke of) had, as Socinus himself had, but a slender opinion of infants' baptism: yet did not absolutely refuse it.

<sup>1528.</sup> For at the synod of Dort, anno 1618, 'was read the confession (A.D. 1618.) of the two brothers, John and Peter Geysteran, 'Remonstrant ministers: and was rejected by all with detestation. 'For it appeared that they, under the name of Remonstrants, and 'under pretence of the five articles, did maintain the horrid and 'execrable blasphemies of Socinus and the anabaptists.' So say the act<sup>t</sup> of the synod. But all that their confession says of baptism is; 'That infants are baptized, not by any positive command of 'God, but to avoid scandal.' And that 'they value the baptism of 'the adult more than that of infants.'

V. In England there were now and then some Dutchmen found of the antipædobaptist opinion ever since the time that it had taken footing in Holland: but none of the English nation are known to <sup>1328.</sup> have embraced it in a long time after. Danvers indeed (A.D. 1428.) would find some of this opinion in England even before those of Munster. He would persuade<sup>u</sup> that the Lollards held it. But they held nothing but what I mentioned before, ch. vi. § 7, that infants dying unbaptized may yet be saved, as I shewed then, and appears more fully by Foxe<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>1433.</sup> In the year 1533, 25th of Henry VIII, John Frith (A.D. 1533.) (who was martyred that year) wrote a short tract, which he calls a Declaration of Baptism: (it is published with his other works, London 1573<sup>x</sup>;) in it he takes notice of the antipædobaptist opinion, as then lately risen in the world, (it was about eleven years standing in Germany, and was but lately got into Holland, for this was a year before the outrage and dispersion at Munster). What he says of it is this<sup>y</sup>, 'Now is there an opinion risen among certain, 'which affirm that children may not be baptized until they come 'unto a perfect age; and that because they have no faith. But 'verily methinketh that they are far from the meekness of Christ 'and his Spirit; which, when children were brought unto him, 'received them lovingly,' &c. And after a short discourse, he breaks off from that point thus: 'But this matter will I pass over; for I trust 'the English (unto whom I write this) have no such opinions.' And that the English Lollards had been all along free from any such opinion, is evident from a very ancient tract of theirs, which they presented to the parliament, which is recited by one Roger Dim-

<sup>t</sup> Acta Synodi Dordrac. Sess. 138.

<sup>u</sup> Treatise, part ii. ch. 7. pag. 303, 304.

<sup>v</sup> In Henry VI. page 608. [p. 661, edit. 1583; p. 868, edit. 1641; p. 752, edit. 1684.]

<sup>x</sup> [Published with those of Tyndal and Barnes. See part ii. p. 90.]

<sup>y</sup> [At page 93.]

mock, who writes an answer to it, and dedicates that answer to king Richard II, which must be about or before the year 1390. This tract is brought to light from some ancient manuscripts at Cambridge, by the learned Dr. Allix, at the end of his Remarks on the History of the Churches of the Albigenes<sup>z</sup>. In it the Lollards, complaining of popish abuses, reckon this for one; the forbidding of marriage, and keeping men from women; from whence did follow effects worse than those of fornication itself committed with women. For, they say, though ‘slaying of children ere they be ‘christened, be full sinful; yet sodomy was worse.’

<sup>1436.</sup> The convocation, anno 1536, do take notice of the (A. D. 1536.) antipædobaptists’ opinions, of which they must have heard from Holland and Germany, (the Munster business having been two years before,) and do pass some decrees against them. The rather, because some people in England began to speak very irreverently and mockingly about some of the ceremonies of baptism then in use.

The lower house of Convocation sent to the upper house a protestation, containing a catalogue of some errors and some profane sayings that began to be handed about among some people; craving the concurrence of the upper house in condemning them. Some of them are these<sup>a</sup>:

17. ‘That it is as lawful to christen a child in a tub of water at home, or in a ditch by the way, as in a font-stone in the church.’

I think it may probably be concluded from their expressions, that the ordinary way of baptizing at this time in England, whether in the church or out of it, was by putting the child into the water.

18. ‘That the water in the font-stone is alonely [only] a thing ‘conjured.

19. ‘That the hallowed oil is no better than the bishop of Rome’s ‘grease or butter.

63. ‘That the holy water is more savoury to make sauce with ‘than the other [water,] because it is mixed with salt; which ‘is also a very good medicine for a horse with a galled back: ‘yea, if there be put an onion thereunto, it is a good sauce for ‘a gibbet of mutton.’

But there is none of all these foolish sayings that reflects any thing on infant-baptism. Yet the king and convocation <sup>1436.</sup> (A. D. 1536.) (apprehensive, I suppose, of what might be) setting forth

<sup>z</sup> [Chapter xxii. p. 205, edit. 1692.]

<sup>a</sup> Fuller’s Church History, book v. sect. 3. [p. 209. 211.]

several articles about religion, to be diligently preached for keeping people steady in it, have these about baptism :

1. ' That the sacrament of baptism was instituted and ordained  
' in the New Testament by our Saviour Jesus Christ, as a  
' thing necessary for the attaining of everlasting life : accord-  
' ing to the saying of Christ ; *Nisi quis renatus fuerit, &c.*  
' *Unless one be born of water, &c.*
2. ' That it is offered unto all men, as well infants, as such as  
' have the use of reason, that by baptism they shall have re-  
' mission of sins,' &c.
3. ' That the promise of grace and everlasting life, which promise  
' is adjoined to the sacrament of baptism, pertaineth not only  
' to such as have the use of reason, but also to infants,' &c.  
———' they are made thereby the very sons and children of  
' God. Insomuch as children dying in their infancy shall un-  
' doubtedly be saved thereby : otherwise not.
4. ' Infants must needs be christened, because they be born in  
' original sin ; which sin must needs be remitted : which can-  
' not be done but by the grace of baptism, whereby they  
' receive the Holy Ghost, which exercises his grace and efficacy  
' in them, and cleanses and purifies them from sin by his most  
' secret virtue and operation.
6. ' That they ought to repute and take all the anabaptists' and  
' Pelagians' opinions contrary to the premises, and every other  
' man's opinion agreeable unto the said anabaptists' and  
' Pelagians' opinions in this behalf, for detestable heresies, and  
' utterly to be condemned.'

These precautions shew, if there were at this time in England no doctrines held by any against infant-baptism, yet that they feared  
1438. lest such should be brought over hither. And two years  
(A. D. 1538.) after, anno 1538, Fuller<sup>a</sup> recites out of Stowe, that  
' four anabaptists, three men and one woman, all Dutch, bare  
' fagots at Paul's Cross : ' and that ' three days after, a man and  
' woman of their sect was burnt in Smithfield.' And says, ' This  
' year the name of this sect first appears in our English chro-  
' nicles.'

But Foxe had spoke of some two or three years before. For taking notice of the influence that queen Anne Boleyn had over Henry VIII, he observes<sup>b</sup>, that during her time ' we read of  
' no great persecution, nor any abjuration to have been in the

<sup>a</sup> Fuller's Church History, book v. sect. 4. [p. 229.]

<sup>b</sup> Martyrology, p. 956. ed. 2. [vol. ii. p. 325, edit. 1641.]



‘ church of England: save only that the registers of London make mention of certain Dutchmen, counted for anabaptists; of whom  
 1435. ‘ ten were put to death in sundry places of the realm,  
 (A.D. 1535.) ‘ anno 1535, other ten repented and were saved.’ This must have been the year before the said convocation.

The bishop of Salisbury, *History of the Reformation*, part i. book 3, p. 195<sup>c</sup>, mentions these men, but not under the name of anabaptists. He says, that in May this year (1535) nineteen Hollanders were accused of some heretical opinions: ‘ Denying Christ to be both God and man; or that he took flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary; or that the sacraments had any effect on those that received them: in which opinions fourteen of them remained obstinate and were burnt by pairs in several places.’ Here is nothing peculiarly about infants’ baptism. But the circumstance of time, May 1535, leads one to think that they were some of them that were to have made a part in the insurrection at Amsterdam. For the author of an English pamphlet<sup>d</sup>, written 1647, called *A short History of the Anabaptists*, (who has made a good collection out of Sleidan, Hortentius, &c.) says, that many Dutchmen from several parts, who had been appointed to assist John Geles in the surprise of Amsterdam beforementioned, hearing the ill success, fled into England in two ships. Now this insurrection was on this very month. And that author reckons those two shiploads to be the first seminary of Dutch antipædobaptists in England. But however that was, there were no English among them.

But although during this king’s reign (and for a good while after, as we shall see) there were no Englishmen that held any opinion against infant-baptism; yet, as I said, that in Germany the papists upbraided the protestants with the name of anabaptists, so it was done here also in the latter times of this reign. For this king Henry VIII, in a speech made at the proroguing of the parliament, Dec. 24, 1545, (recited by the Lord Herbert<sup>e</sup> at that year,) complaining of the great discord among his subjects, and of the reproachful names they gave one to another, says; ‘ What love and charity is amongst you, when one calleth another heretic and anabaptist: and he calleth him again papist, hypocrite, and pharisee?’

<sup>c</sup> [Edit. fol. Lond. 1679.]

<sup>d</sup> [See ‘ *A short History of the Anabaptists of High and Low Germany.*’ 4to. London, 1642, [not 1647 as stated by Wall,] pages 48 and 55.]

<sup>e</sup> [See *The Life and Reign of King Henry the Eighth*, by Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury, folio, London, 1649, p. 535, 536.]

1449. In king Edward's time: in the third year of his reign, (A.D. 1549.) Heylyn says<sup>f</sup>; 'At the same time the anabaptists, who ' had kept themselves unto themselves in the late king's time, began ' to look abroad, and disperse their dotages; for the preventing of ' which mischief, before it grew unto a head, some of the chiefs of ' them were convented,' &c. He does not say whether these were Dutch or English. And at the same year 1549, Ottius, in his *Annales Anabaptist*. recites a letter from Hooper to Bullinger, wherein he complains that England was troubled with a sort of anabaptists; but reciting their tenets, he mentions nothing of infant-baptism, nor does he say whether they were English or foreigners.

In queen Mary's time, Philpot had, a little before his martyrdom, an occasion to write a letter<sup>g</sup> to a fellow-prisoner of his, to satisfy him in some doubts that he had concerning the lawfulness of infant-baptism. This shews that the question was then ventilated in England. Philpot, besides the arguments from Scripture, brings some of the quotations from antiquity that I have produced; and concludes; 'The verity of antiquity is on our side; and the anabaptists have nothing but lies for them, and new imaginations; ' which feign the baptism of children to be the pope's commandment.'

But this good man grants a great deal more of the question in point of antiquity than he should have done, when he says in his 280. letter, 'Auxentius, one of the Arian sect, with his ad- (A.D. 380.) ' herents, was one of the first that denied the baptism of 315. (A.D. 415.) ' children; and next after him Pelagius the heretic. And 1030. (A.D. 1130.) ' some other there were in St. Bernard's time, as it doth ' appear by his writings. And in our days the anabaptists,' &c.

The ground of his mistake concerning the Arians, that they should be against infants' baptism, is, that the Arians are by some old writers called anabaptists; but that was because they rebaptized all that had been baptized by the catholics, in infancy or at age; not that they disliked infants' baptism: as I shewed before<sup>h</sup>. And the particular mistake concerning Auxentius must have been caused by those words of St. Ambrose in his oration against Auxentius<sup>i</sup>; 'why then does Auxentius say, that the faithful people, who ' have been baptized in the name of the Trinity must be baptized ' again?' Where any one that will read the place will see that Aux-

<sup>f</sup> History of the Reformation, p. 73. [of the third edition, fol. London, 1674.]

<sup>g</sup> Foxe, *Martyrol*. page 1670. edit. 2 [vol. iii. p. 606, 607, 609. edit. 1641.]

<sup>h</sup> Ch. iv. § 3.

<sup>i</sup> [§ 37. tom. ii. p. 874, of the Benedictine edition of St. Ambrose's Works.]

entius' reason for saying so, was not any difference that the two parties had about infants' baptism, but the different faith they had about the Trinity, in whose name baptism was given.

Pelagius denied original sin: from whence Philpot, by too visible a mistake, concluded he had denied infants' baptism.

<sup>1465.</sup> In the beginning of queen Elizabeth's reign, as there (A. D. 1565.) were no English antipædobaptists, so there were very few left in Holland; till after the revolt of those provinces from Spain they increased again.

For bishop Jewell, in his Defence of his Apology, written about the seventh year of this queen, being twitted by Harding with the anabaptists; 'Are not these your brethren?' And Harding having said that the Roman Catholic countries were cleared of them, (among which he expressly there reckons Base Almain, i. e. the Dutch Low Countries,) Jewell replies to him; 'They find harbour amongst you in Austria, Silesia, Moravia, and such other countries where the gospel of Christ is suppressed: but they have no acquaintance with us, neither in England, nor in Germany, nor in France, nor in Scotland, nor in Denmark, nor in Sweden, nor in any place else where the gospel of Christ is clearly preached<sup>k</sup>.'

<sup>1465.</sup> From whence we may gather, that this sort of people (A. D. 1565.) were at this time (which was about forty years after their rise) almost totally suppressed in all these parts of the world.

<sup>1472.</sup> But yet about the sixteenth year of queen Elizabeth, a (A. D. 1572.) congregation of Dutch antipædobaptists was discovered without Aldgate in London; whereof twenty-seven were taken and imprisoned. And the next month one Dutchman and ten women were condemned. One woman recanted; eight were banished; two were burnt in Smithfield, as Fuller<sup>l</sup> out of Stowe relates. Their tenets are recited these; 'Infants not to be baptized. Christians not to use the sword. All oaths unlawful. Christ took not flesh of the Virgin Mary.' This agrees in every point with the account given before of the doctrine of the Minnists. These were the first that that queen ever caused to be burnt for any opinion in religion.

Foxe, that wrote the Book of Martyrs, was then living; and he ventured to intercede with the queen for the life of those two, but could not prevail; she shewing such a sense of the necessity of suppressing any new sect by severity at the beginning. In his letter to her there are these words: 'As for their errors indeed, no man of

<sup>k</sup> [See The Defence of the Apology, part i. chapter 4, division 3, page 25, 26.

of Jewell's Works, fol. London, 1609.]

<sup>l</sup> Ch. Hist. 9th book, sect. 3. [p. 104.]



‘sense can deny that they are most absurd; and I wonder that  
 ‘such monstrous opinions could come into the mind of any Christ-  
 ‘ian. But such is the state of human weakness; if we are left  
 ‘never so little a while destitute of the Divine light, whither is it  
 ‘that we do not fall? And there is great reason to give God thanks  
 ‘on this account, that I hear not of any Englishman that is inclined  
 ‘to that madness,’ &c. He entreats the queen that these two may  
 be banished as the rest were; or otherwise punished. ‘But to roast  
 ‘alive the bodies of poor wretches, that offend rather by blindness  
 ‘of judgment than perverseness of will, in fire and flames raging  
 ‘with pitch and brimstone, is a hardhearted thing, and more agree-  
 ‘able to the practice of the Romanists than the custom of the  
 ‘Evangelics<sup>m</sup>.’

From his words Fuller concludes, that this opinion had not then taken any footing among the English: for Foxe was likely to know if it had.

VI. At what time it began to be embraced by any English I do not find it easy to discover. But it is plain that no very considerable number in England were of this persuasion till about sixty

<sup>1541.</sup> years ago. The first book (except some books taken in a  
 (A.D. 1641.) Jesuit’s trunk, which he had brought over on purpose to spread this opinion, which I must mention by and by, but except them the first) that ever I heard of, that was set forth in English, upholding this tenet, was a Dutch book, called *A plain and well grounded Treatise concerning Baptism*. This was translated and

<sup>1518.</sup> printed in English anno 1618, the sixteenth year of James  
 (A.D. 1618.) the First. But neither in that king’s reign, nor in that of his son king Charles the First, till toward the latter end of it, have we any account of any considerable number of people of this way, very little mention of them, or of that question, in any English books.

<sup>1545.</sup> Dr. Featly, who wrote in 1645, says in his preface;  
 (A.D. 1645.) ‘This fire in the reigns of queen Elizabeth, king James,  
 ‘and our gracious sovereign, till now, was covered in England  
 ‘under the ashes; or if it broke out at any time, by the care of the  
 ‘ecclesiastical and civil magistrates it was soon put out. But of  
 ‘late, since the unhappy distractions,—this sect hath rebaptized  
 ‘hundreds of men and women together in the twilight, in rivulets,  
 ‘and some arms of the Thames,’ &c. And in his letter to Mr. Downham, (prefixed to the above-named work,) mentioning the great increase of monstrous sects and heresies at that time, espe-

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. [Fuller gives the letter, which is in Latin, from Foxe’s own handwriting.]

cially of papists and anabaptists, he says, ‘They boast of their great draught of fish; the papists of twenty thousand proselytes, the anabaptists of forty-seven churches<sup>n</sup>.’ Upon which view of sects arising in such times, he does in another place of his book set forth the mischiefs of a general toleration in any state: which observation of the doctor’s, made upon the first toleration that had ever been in England, the experience of all times since following has shewn to be a just one. None can deny but that this evil does follow upon it, how necessary soever it may sometimes be on other respects.

<sup>1542.</sup> It was during the rebellion against king Charles I, and (A. D. 1642.) the usurpation of Oliver Cromwell, that this opinion began <sup>1553.</sup> (A. D. 1653.) to have any great number of converts to it. In those times of stirs, they boasted in their books that that prophecy was fulfilled; *many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased<sup>o</sup>*. That usurper gave not only a toleration, but great encouragement to all sorts of religions that opposed the church of England and the presbyterians. Neither of these could he trust; but laboured to weaken them what he could. And the more dissenters and separatists there were from these, the safer he reckoned he sat. The event of these joining afterward together to vindicate their country from tyranny and utter confusion, shewed that he was in the right.

In these times of general liberty, this opinion increased mightily; many owning it out of conscience, (we must in charity judge,) as thinking it to be the truth; but many also for advantage. For Oliver, next to his darling Independents, favoured this sort of men most; and his army was in great part made up of them. You must suppose, then, that they left out of their scheme of doctrines that tenet of the Minnists, ‘that the sword is not to be made use of by Christians;’ for they had, many of them, the places of troopers, captains, major-generals, committee-men, sequestrators, &c.

<sup>1558.</sup> It appears by a passage in the life of judge Hale<sup>p</sup>, how (A. D. 1658.) much that party was favoured at that time. For it is there related how that judge having the case brought before him ‘of some anabaptists who had rushed into a church, and disturbed a congregation while they were receiving the sacrament, not without some violence; at this he was highly offended. For he said it was intolerable for men, who pretended so highly to liberty of conscience, to go and disturb others, &c. But these were so supported by

<sup>n</sup> [See ‘The Dippers dipt: or the Anabaptists ducked and plunged over head and ears, at a disputation in Southwark: by Daniel Featly, D. D. 4to, sixth edition, London, 1651.’]

<sup>o</sup> Daniel xii. 4.

<sup>p</sup> Burnet’s Life and Death of Sir Matthew Hale, p. 44. [8vo. London, 1682; and frequently reprinted.]

‘some great magistrates and officers, that a stop was put to his ‘proceedings. Upon which he declared, he would meddle no more ‘with the trials on the crown side.’ Yet some time before the death of the usurper, many of the antipædobaptists as well as of the other separate parties that had raised him, fell into a dislike of him, and he of them. So far that he, as one captain Dean relates, cashiered several of them; and they, as the lord chancellor Clarendon relates, entered into several conspiracies to assassinate him.

I have been advertised that I ought in this second edition to insert, in order to their vindication, their address to king Charles II, recited by that noble lord in the fifteenth book of his excellent *History of the Rebellion*<sup>r</sup>. I will therefore give the substance of it in short; being sorry that it does not tend more to their credit than it does. They (as well as all the other parties of that time except the churchmen) seemed to have returned to their allegiance to the king, not out of conscience, but because they found themselves undone without him.

Several sorts and sects of men joined in the address; but it was sent to the king, being then at Bruges, by a gentleman, an antipædobaptist of special trust among them. They recount how under king Charles I. there had been ‘many errors, defects, excesses, ‘irregularities, &c. as blots and stains upon the otherwise good ‘government of that king;’ whom they own to have been ‘of the ‘best and purest morals of any prince that ever swayed the English ‘sceptre:’ that the parliament had raised war to free him from ‘evil counsellors:’ that they among the rest, had on this account taken arms: and that though they are since sensible that under pretence of ‘liberty and reformation,’ the secret designs of ‘wicked and ‘ambitious persons’ had been hid; yet that they themselves had ‘gone ‘out in the simplicity of their souls,’ having never had thoughts of ‘casting off their allegiance, or extirpating the royal family,’ but only of ‘restraining the excesses of government. Thus far,’ they say, ‘they had gone right,’ and had ‘as yet done nothing but what they ‘thought themselves able to justify’ [strange that they could say this]. But that in all their motions since they had been ‘roving up and down ‘in all the untrodden paths of fanatic notions;’ and now found themselves ‘involved in so many labyrinths and meanders of knavery,’ that they know not how to extricate themselves. ‘Into what crimes, ‘impieties, wickednesses, and unheard-of villanies, have we,’ say they, ‘been led, cheated, cozened, and betrayed, by that grand im-

<sup>r</sup> [At the year 1658; vol. iii. p. 488, &c. of the folio edit. 1704; and vol. vii. p. 254. &c. edit. 8vo. Oxford, 1826.]



‘postor, that loathsome hypocrite, that detestable traitor, that  
 ‘prodigy of nature, &c. who now calls himself our protector!——  
 ‘We have trampled underfoot all authorities; we have laid vio-  
 ‘lent hands upon our own sovereign; we have ravished our  
 ‘parliaments, &c.: we have put a yoke, a heavy yoke of iron,  
 ‘upon the necks of our own countrymen; broken oaths, vows, en-  
 ‘gagements, covenants, &c., lifted up our hands to heaven deceit-  
 ‘fully;—and added hypocrisy to all our sins.——We were some-  
 ‘times wise to pull down; but we now want art to build. We were  
 ‘ingenious to pluck up; but we have no skill to plant. We were  
 ‘strong to destroy; but we are weak to restore. Whither shall we  
 ‘go for help? If to parliaments; they are broken reeds. If we turn  
 ‘to the army; they are a rod of iron to bruise us. If we go to him  
 ‘who had treacherously usurped, and does tyrannically exercise an  
 ‘unjust power over us, &c.; he says, “I have chastised you with  
 ‘whips, and will henceforward with scorpions.”——At last  
 ‘we began to whisper among ourselves,—“Why should we not  
 ‘return to our first husband?” &c.’

And so (after many long turns of canting expressions) they come at last to this; that they find themselves engaged in duty, honour, and conscience, to make this humble address, &c.; but yet declare that ‘lest they should seem altogether negligent of that first good  
 ‘cause, which God had so eminently owned them in,’ &c., they think it necessary to offer the following propositions, (which his lordship justly calls ‘extravagant and wild’ ones,) to which if his majesty would condescend, then they would hazard their lives to re-establish him.

1. ‘That the king do resettlement the long parliament, with the ex-  
 ‘cluded members.
2. ‘That he ratify all the concessions made by his father at the  
 ‘treaty in the Isle of Wight. [Now those concessions were (as  
 ‘this noble historian observes in another place, book 16. p. 723,  
 ‘&c. ed. Oxf. 1706.) “such as in truth did, with the preser-  
 ‘vation of the name and life of the king, near as much esta-  
 ‘blish a republican government, as was settled after his murder.”  
 ‘And such as “his Majesty yielded to with much less cheer-  
 ‘fulness than he walked to the scaffold.”]
3. ‘That he should set up an universal toleration of all religions.’
4. ‘Abolish all payment of tithes.’
5. ‘Pass a general act of oblivion.’

The gentleman added in a letter of his own, that he desired the

sum of two thousand pounds to be remitted to him from the king; which sum not being at that time in his majesty's power, this proposal came to nothing.

It was by reason of the increase which had been of this opinion in those times, that the convocation which sat presently after the <sup>1561.</sup> restoration of king Charles II, when they made a review (A.D. 1661.) of the Book of Common Prayer, found it necessary to add to it an office for the baptism of those who having been born in those times had not yet been baptized; whereof there were many that were now grown too old to be baptized as infants, and ought to make profession of their own faith. They give in the preface to the said book an account of the occasion that made this necessary then, though not formerly, in these words: 'Together with an office for the baptism of such as are of riper years. Which although not so necessary when the former book was compiled; yet by the growth of anabaptism, through the licentiousness of the late times crept in among us, is now become necessary.'

The parliament, assembled upon the said restoration, expressed the dislike the nation had conceived against the tenets and behaviour of these men; when making an act for the confirming all ministers in the possession of their benefices, how heterodox soever they had been, provided they would conform for the future, they excepted such as had been of this way.

It is to be noted, that when this opinion began first to increase, they did not all of them proceed to separation from the established church; they held it sufficient to declare their sentiment against infant-baptism, to reserve their own children to adult-baptism, and to be baptized with it themselves; without renouncing communion in prayers, and in the other sacrament, with the pædobaptists. In <sup>1545.</sup> the year 1645, when Marshall had in a sermon objected (A.D. 1645.) to the antipædobaptists the sin of separation, Tombes answers, that this was practised only by some: that it was the fault of the persons, not of the principle of antipædobaptism: that he himself abhorred it: and he quotes, as concurring with him, <sup>1544.</sup> 'the Confession of Faith<sup>t</sup> in the name of seven Churches (A.D. 1644.) ' of Antipædobaptists in London, Art. 33.'

But these that continued in communion were not for Oliver's turn. There was great care taken to instil into them principles of total separation; which proved too effectual: and within a while they did all, or almost all, renounce the settled congregations, and

<sup>s</sup> Examen, part ii. § 9. [p. 31. edit. 1645.]

<sup>t</sup> [Published at London, in 4to, in the year 1644.]

became great enemies to them. In which separation they do still, almost all, continue.

The present state of them is this :

They that are now, are as commendable as any other sort of men are, for a sober and grave, quiet and peaceable way of living. They profess obedience to magistrates : and they will commonly express a dislike and abhorrence of those plunderings and other violences committed by some of their party, as well as by the rest of the army of that usurper aforesaid, of odious memory. They are particularly commended for maintaining their poor liberally, (which is a way that never fails to attract the good-will of the multitude, and to make proselytes,) as also for passing censures upon such members of their own congregations as live disorderly.

This character, of obedient subjects, is what they now own and profess ; and what I hope is the real sentiment of most of them. One Mr. Hicks did indeed about twenty years ago (if what was informed against him were true) give a most ugly and reproachful account of the whole body of this people as to this point.

There was at that time, 1683, a villanous conspiracy, headed by Shaftsbury, Monmouth, &c. against king Charles ; either to murder, or at least depose him. The conspirators sent their emissaries about, to see what numbers and parties of the people could be drawn in to join in the rebellion. And amongst other discoveries made afterward of this treason, there was this following information given upon oath by one Mr. West of the Temple, which is printed in the account of that plot. Copies of Informations, p. 41.

‘ This examinant further says, That Mr. Roe told this examinant, ‘ that he had discoursed with one Mr. Hicks a tobaccoist, an anabaptist preacher, a great ringleader of the anabaptists ; and that ‘ the said Hicks had told him that the anabaptists could, and he ‘ believed upon good consideration would, make up an army of ‘ twenty thousand men, and fifteen hundred of the twenty thousand ‘ would be horse : and though perhaps there would be a necessity of ‘ making use of some great men at the beginning, (and this ‘ examinant thinks he mentioned the duke of Monmouth,) yet when ‘ the anabaptists were once up, they would not lay down their arms ‘ till they had their own terms.’

If Hicks did never say so, he ought to have publicly disowned it. And if he did, the antipædobaptists ought to have disowned him from being a leader. Whether either of them were done, or whether Hicks be now living, I know not. God Almighty keep all sorts of people from such leaders, as will lead them in a way to



which the Scripture expressly assigns damnation. But however, there were but two men of the twenty thousand that appeared then to have been guilty; and those two were among some of the first that made an ingenuous and voluntary confession. And besides, it is not credible that that party of men could at that time have made up such a number, if they had been never so unanimous in the wickedness. P. S. I hear since<sup>u</sup> that Hicks is dead; but that he lived in London many years after this; and that the fore-said accusation was not made good against him; but that king Charles II, upon a hearing of his case in council, discharged him.

1560. The number of them had been considerably abated upon (A. D. 1660.) the restauration, and the resettling of the church of England. Many at that time returned to the church, and brought the children which they had had in the mean time, to be baptized according to the order thereof. And during the remainder of king Charles' reign the number of them stood much at a stay, or rather 1587. decreased; but since late times of general liberty and (A. D. 1687.) toleration, they have increased again. In some of the counties of England they are the most numerous of any sort of men that do separate from the established church. This is chiefly in the east parts; Essex, Kent, Sussex, Surrey, &c. There are very few in those parts that make any separation from the church, but they. Which is the occasion that I, as I am placed in those parts<sup>x</sup>, have the more minded what I have read in any ancient book relating to that question; from whence have sprung the notes that make the first part of this work. In other parts of England they are much over-numbered by the Quakers. There are also great numbers of them in London and the suburbs. And it is observed from some late passages, that the presbyterians look as if they would court their friendship, and as if they aimed to add this stick also to the other two.

Their tenets are, besides the denying infants baptism, these:

1. They do many of them hold it necessary, as I said, to renounce communion with all Christians that are not of their way. Many of them are so peremptory in this, that if they be in the chamber of a sick man, and any pædobaptist, minister or other, come in to pray with him, they will go out of the room. And if they be invited to the funeral of any pædobaptist, they will go to the house, and accompany the corpse with the rest of the people to the church door: but there they retreat; they call it the *Steeple-house*. They seem to

<sup>u</sup> [His informant was Mr. Stennett; see 'Defence,' chapter vi.]

<sup>x</sup> [He was at this time vicar of Shoreham in Kent.]

judge thus: those that are not baptized are no Christians, and none are baptized but themselves. So they make not only baptism itself, but also the time, or age, or way of receiving it, a fundamental.

It is strange to see how deeply this principle of division is rooted in some of them by the care that many of their teachers take to cultivate it. If any one that has been one of them, be afterward prevailed on to go ordinarily to church, and hold communion in all things that he can, though he keep still his opinion of antipædobaptism, they of them that are of this principle bemoan him as a lost man; and speak of him as we should do of one that had turned an apostate from the Christian religion. If any man, being not satisfied with the baptism he received in infancy, do desire to be baptized again by them, but do at the same time declare that he means to keep communion with the established church in all things that in conscience he can; there are (or at least have been) several of their elders that will not baptize such a man. To renounce 'the Devil and all his works,' &c. has been always required of persons to be baptized into the Christian religion; but to require them to renounce communion with all Christians that are not of their opinion, is to baptize into a sect. It is a clear case from Scripture, and particularly from Phil. iii. 15, 16, that the duty of Christian unity does require that they (and the same is to be said of all others that differ not in fundamentals) should hold communion as far as they can; even though they do still continue in their opinion for adult-baptism. Of which I shall say something more in the last chapter.

I said before that this scrupulous stiffness is not universal among them. Tombes, and several more had, and some of them still have, truer sentiments concerning 'the communion of saints in the catholic church.' And I have received of late a credible account, that the most considerable men, and of chief repute among them, do more and more come over to these sentiments.

2. They are, more generally than the antipædobaptists of other nations, possessed with an opinion of the absolute necessity of the immersion, or dipping the baptized person over head and ears into the water. So far, as to allow of no clinical baptism: i. e. If a man that is sick in a fever, &c. (so as that he cannot be put into the water without endangering his life,) do desire baptism before he

γ [Compare Wall's Defence, chap. vi. in reply to Gale's remark at p. 239. of his Reflections.]

dies; they will let him die unbaptized, rather than baptize him by affusion of water on his face, &c.

They are contrary in this to the primitive Christians. They, though they did ordinarily put the person into the water, yet in case of sickness, &c. would baptize him in his bed.

They bring three proofs of the necessity of immersion or dipping:

1. 'The example of John baptizing Christ, of Philip baptizing the eunuch, and generally of the ancient Christians baptizing by immersion.'
2. 'That baptism ought, as much as may be, to resemble the death and burial and rising again of Christ.'
3. 'That the word *to baptize* does necessarily include dipping in its signification; so that Christ, by commanding to baptize, has commanded to dip.'

To which these answers are commonly given:

The first proves what was said before, that in Scripture times, and in the times next succeeding, it was the custom in those hot countries to baptize ordinarily by immersion: but not that in cases of sickness, or other such extraordinary occasions, they never baptized otherwise. Of this I shall speak in the next chapter.

The second proves, that dipping, where it may safely be used, is the most fitting manner. But our Saviour has taught us a rule, Matt. xii. 3, 4, 7, that what is needful to preserve life is to be preferred before outward ceremonies.

The third, which would if it were true be more conclusive than the rest, is plainly a mistake. The word βαπτίζω in Scripture signifies *to wash* in general, without determining the sense to this or that sort of washing. The sense of a Scripture word is not to be taken from the use of it in secular authors, but from the use of it in the Scripture. What βαπτίζω signifies among Greek writers, and what interpretation critics and lexicons do accordingly give it, is not much to the purpose in this case to dispute, (though they also, as Mr. Walker in his *Doctrine of Baptism*<sup>z</sup> has largely shewn, beside the signification *immergo*, do give that of *lavo* in general,) when the sense in which it is used by the penmen of Scripture may otherwise be plainly determined from Scripture itself. Now in order to such a determination these two things are plain:

First, that *to baptize* is a word applied in Scripture not only to such washing as is by dipping into the water the thing or person

<sup>z</sup> [See 'The Doctrine of Baptisms; or a discourse of dipping and sprinkling: wherein is shewed the lawfulness of

'other ways of baptismation, besides that of a total immersion.' By William Walker, B.D.' 8vo. London, 1678.]



washed; but also to such as is by pouring or rubbing water on the thing or person washed, or some part of it.

Secondly, That the sacramental washing is often in Scripture expressed by other words beside baptizing; which other words do signify washing in the ordinary and general sense.

For the first there are, besides others, these plain instances:

The Jews thought it a piece of religion to wash their hands before dinner: they blame the disciples, Mark vii. 5, for eating with *unwashed hands*. The word here is *νίπτω*, an ordinary word for washing the hands. Their way of that washing was this: they had servants to pour the water on their hands, 2 Kings iii. 11, *who poured water on the hands of Elijah*, i.e. who waited on him as a servant<sup>a</sup>. Now this washing of the hands is called by St. Luke the baptizing of a man, or the man's being baptized, Luke xi. 38. For where the English is, *The Pharisee marvelled that he had not washed before dinner*, St. Luke's own words are, *ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου*, 'that he was not baptized before dinner.' And so they are translated in the Latin. A plain instance, that they used the word *to baptize* for any ordinary washing, whether there were dipping in the case or not.

Also that which is translated, Mark vii. 4, *the washing of pots, cups, brassen vessels, tables*, is in the original, the baptizing of pots, &c. And what is there said, *When they come from market, except they wash, they eat not*; the words of St. Mark are, *Except they be baptized, they eat not*<sup>b</sup>. And the divers washings of the Jews are called *διάφοροι βαπτισμοί*, *divers baptisms*, Heb. ix. 10. Of which some were by bathing, others by sprinkling, Numb. viii. 7. Item xix. 18, 19.

For the second there are these:

Baptism is styled *λουτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος*, *the washing of water*, Eph. v. 26. *λουτρὸν τῆς παλιγγενεσίας*, *the washing of regeneration*, Tit. iii. 5. And to express this saying; *having our bodies baptized with clean water*; the apostle words it, *λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα*, *having our bodies washed*, καὶ ἐρρατισμένοι τὰς καρδίας, *and our hearts sprinkled*, Heb. x. 22. These words for washing are such as are the most usual for the ordinary ways of washing: the same, for example, with that which is used, Acts xvi. 33, *He washed their stripes*. No man will think they were put into water for that.

<sup>a</sup> Dr. Pocock has largely proved from Maimonides and others this was the Jews' way. 'Non lavant manus nisi e vase affusa aqua.' Not. Misc. c. 9. [See *Notæ Miscellanæ*, being an Appen-

dix to his *Porta Mosis*, 4to. Oxoniæ, 1655, especially p. 365.]

<sup>b</sup> This was not dipping. 'Lavantes a foro totum corpus non mersabant.' Pocock, Not. Mis. c. 9.

They had several words to signify washing. And they used them promiscuously for the sacramental washing, and for other washings. It is the Christians since, that have appropriated the word *baptize* to the sacramental washing: much after the same rate as they have appropriated the word *Bible*, which in Greek is any book, to the book of God; or the word *Scripture*, which in the Scripture itself signifies any writing, to the Divine writings.

I did not in the first nor second edition proceed to give any instances out of any other book beside the Scripture of the word βαπτίζω used for washing by perfusion partly because it does not belong to the main matter of my book, which is a history, not of the manner of administering baptism, but of the subjects of it; infants, or adult only: and partly, because I had, as for other authors, referred the reader to Mr. Walker's Doctrine of Baptisms; where there are a great many. But yet having lately met with a very plain instance of that use of the word in Origen, which I think is not among Mr. Walker's, I will give it to the reader. It is in his *Comment. in Joann.* tom. vii. p. 116. ed. Rothom. 1668<sup>c</sup>.

He is there examining the ground of that upbraiding demand made by the Pharisees to St. John; why he baptized, if he were not the Christ, nor Elias, nor that prophet; and says, that they had no reason to think that either the Christ, or Elias, when they came, would baptize in their own persons. And accordingly that Jesus (who was the Christ, and that prophet) did not baptize in his own person, but his disciples. And concerning Elias, speaks thus to the Pharisees:

Πόθεν δὲ ὑμῖν πεπίστευται Ἡλίαν βαπτίσειν τὸν ἐλευσόμενον; οὐδὲ τὰ ἐπὶ τὰ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ξύλα, κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ Ἀχαὰβ χρόνους, δεόμενα λουτροῦ, ἵνα ἐκκαυθῇ, ἐπιφανέντος ἐν πυρὶ τοῦ Κυρίου βαπτίσαντος; ἐπικέλεται γὰρ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, &c.——ὁ τοίνυν μὴ αὐτὸς βαπτίσας τότε, ἀλλ' ἐτέροις τοῦ ἔργου παραχωρήσας, πῶς κατὰ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μαλαχίου λεγόμενα ἐπιδημήσας βαπτίζειν ἔμελλε

‘How come you to think that Elias, when he should come, would baptize; who did not in Ahab's time baptize the wood upon the altar, which was to be washed before it was burnt by the Lord's appearing in fire? But he orders the priests to do that; not once only, but says, *Do it the second time; and they did it the second time: and, Do it the third time; and they did it the third time.* He therefore that did not himself baptize then, but assigned that work to others, how was he likely to baptize, when he, according to Malachy's prophecy, should come?’

<sup>c</sup> [Comment. tom. vi. sect. 13. apud edit Benedictin. Op. vol. iv. pag. 125.]

In the text, 1 Kings xviii. 33, the order given by Elijah is; *Fill four barrels with water; and pour it on the burnt sacrifice, and on the wood. And he said, Do it the second time, &c.*

This Origen calls the baptizing of the wood.

But to proceed with the tenets of the antipædobaptists of England.

3. As exact as the antipædobaptists are in imitating the primitive way used in the hot countries, they do not baptize naked: which those ancient Christians always did, when they baptized by immersion; as I shew in the next chapter. They usually spoke of *the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh*, as a thing signified by the unclothing of the person to be baptized. I suppose it is for preserving modesty that they dispense with that custom. So it seems in some cases they can allow of dispensing with the primitive custom.

4. But a more material thing, in which some of them do deviate both from the express command of our Saviour and the received practice of the church, is in the form of baptism. One sort of them do count it indifferent whether they baptize with these words; *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*: or with these; *In the name of the Lord Jesus*. And do in their public confession<sup>d</sup> allow either of the forms. And I have heard that some of them do affectedly choose the latter. But I am told, by one who should know<sup>e</sup>, that whatever has been done formerly, they that do so now are very few; and those, men not well thought of by the general body of them, but only such as are suspected to be underhand Socinians; for they have many such among them: and it is not for the use of those that have a mind to obliterate the belief of the Trinity, to baptize their proselytes into the faith and name of it. I believe one reason why Socinus had such a mind to abolish all use of baptism among his followers, was because persons baptized in *the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit*, would be always apt to think those names to express the Deity in which they were to believe: which he did not mean they should do. And some of his followers have been so disgusted with that form of baptism, that they have given profane insinuations<sup>f</sup> that those words were not originally in the Scripture, but were taken from the usual doxology into the form of baptism, and then inserted into the text of Matt. xxviii. 19.

Those that baptize only in *the name of the Lord Jesus* plead the

<sup>d</sup> Confession of the Anabaptists, re- chap. vi.]  
printed, Lond. 1691.

<sup>e</sup> [Mr. Stennet. See Wall's Defence, part i. page 22.]

<sup>f</sup> The Judgment of the Fathers, &c.



examples of the apostles, Acts viii. 16; item, xix. 5. But though in those passages, where the matters of fact are related in short, there be mentioned in the recital only the name of the Lord Jesus, because that was the name that the apostles found it most difficult to persuade the Jews to own, (they having already, as St. Cyprian says<sup>z</sup>, the ancient baptism of Moses and of the law, were now to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ,) yet interpreters have taken it for granted, that in the conferring those baptisms the apostles used the whole form which our Saviour had prescribed. Origen in Rom. vi. Didymus, lib. ii. de Spiritu Sancto. Cyprian. Epist. ad Jubaianum. Augustinus passim. Canon Apostol. 41, 42. aliis 49, 50. And Athanasius says<sup>b</sup>, ‘He that is baptized only in the name of the Father, or only in the name of the Son, or without the Holy Spirit, &c. receives nothing.’ In short, it is true which St. Austin says<sup>i</sup>, that ‘in Church-History you shall oftener meet with heretics that do not baptize at all, than with any that do baptize with any other words,’ viz. than those of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

295. Yet we do find one sort of heretics that did so. It was (A. D. 395.) one sect of the Eunomians, who, Sozomen says<sup>k</sup>, were the first that ever did it. And he gives his opinion that they are in as ill case as if they were not baptized at all.

5. Some other singular opinions they hold that do not at all relate to baptism. Some of them (but I think it is but few in England) do hold that error which has of old been attributed to the antipædobaptists of Germany, and is said to be still held by the Minnists of Holland, that Christ took not flesh of the Virgin Mary, but had it from heaven; and only passed through her, as water through a pipe, without receiving any of his human substance from her. The Belgic confession<sup>l</sup> calls this the ‘heresy of the anabaptists.’

It is strange to observe in how many heresies, old and new, this odd opinion, so plainly contrary to Scripture, has made an ingre-

20. dient. It was first invented by the Gnostics and Valenti- (A. D. 120.) nians; for they explained all that they believed of our Saviour’s human nature in this manner; as we perceive by Irenæus<sup>m</sup>.

40. Also by Tertullian<sup>n</sup> we understand that beside them Mar- (A. D. 140.) cion and Apelles (that was one of his followers) held the

<sup>z</sup> Epist. ad Jubaianum.

<sup>b</sup> Epist. ad Serapionem.

<sup>i</sup> Lib. vi. contra Donatistas, cap. 25.

<sup>k</sup> Eccles. Hist. vi. cap. 26.

<sup>l</sup> Artic. 18. [See this confession in the ‘Sylloge Confessionum sub tempus re-

formandæ Ecclesiæ editarum,’ 8<sup>o</sup>. Oxon. 1804; again 1827.]

<sup>m</sup> Lib. i. cap. i. circa medium. Item, lib. iii. cap. 17.

<sup>n</sup> De Carne Christi, cap. vi, &c.

88. same, but with this difference; Marcion said our Saviour (A. D. 183.) had no real flesh at all, but only in appearance; Apelles owned real flesh, but not of human race; but made of the substance of the stars and heavenly bodies, which was brought into the Virgin's body only to pass through her. Athanasius also ascribes this opinion<sup>o</sup>

110. (A. D. 210.) to the Marcionists. Gennadius<sup>p</sup>, besides that he

348. (A. D. 448.) also names Marcion, says that Origen and Euty-

270. (A. D. 370.) ches taught that Christ's flesh was brought from heaven. And Gregory Nazianzen, in an epistle to Nectarius<sup>q</sup>, tells him that he had met with a book of Apollinarius, that maintained this heretical tenet, 'that in the dispensation of the incarnation of 'the only Son of God, he did not take flesh from without to repair 'our nature, but there was the nature of flesh in the Son of God 'from all eternity.' But I hear that Canisius<sup>r</sup> has found and published an epistle of his wherein he disowns it. I shewed before<sup>s</sup> that this of Christ's flesh only passing through the body of the Vir-

1150. gin made one of the monstrous tenets of one sort of the (A. D. 1250.) Cathari, spoken of by Reinerius, who were Manichees in 220. (A. D. 320.) the main. The old Manichees held that he had properly no flesh at all, that he was not born of Mary, but came from the first man, which first man was not of this earth.

Most of the old heretics that taught this, did it because they would not yield that our Saviour did really condescend so far as to take on him human nature, and be properly *a man made* (as St. Paul expresses it) *of a woman*: so they made use of it to impugn his humanity. But we have reason to judge that most that hold it now, do it to impugn his divinity: for by this subterfuge, that his flesh was sent originally from heaven, and only passed through the body of the Virgin, they evade the arguments for his divinity and præexistence, taken from those places of Scripture which speak of his *coming from heaven, coming forth from the Father, and coming into the world*, &c. expounding these texts, not of an eternal præexistence, but of his flesh made in heaven and sent down. For they do not understand it, as Apollinarius is said to have done, that this heavenly flesh was from eternity, but made at a certain time before the world, as the Arians said his divine nature was.

So that this opinion, as well as the former, fits those antipædobaptists best that are inclined to Socinianism. But what then will these men make at last of our blessed Saviour? The old heretics,

<sup>o</sup> De Salutari Adventu adv. Apollinaristas.

<sup>p</sup> De Eccles. dogm. cap. 2.

<sup>q</sup> Apud Sozom. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. cap. 27.

<sup>r</sup> Antiquæ Lectionis, tom. v. [4<sup>o</sup>. Incolstadii, 1601, &c.]

<sup>s</sup> Chap. vii. § 4.

some of them denied him to be God, and others of them denied him to be properly man : but these deny both, and say that he is neither God, nor properly man ; as not being made of a woman, nor the seed of David. Will they make no more of him than the ' Jesus ' Christ of the Quakers,' many of whom speak of Jesus Christ as being nothing else but something within themselves, a notion of their brains ? But there are, as I said, few of the English antipædobaptists that hold this : some foreign ones, it seems, do.

Whereas Gennadius imputes, as I said, this opinion to Origen : I did suspect it (when in the first edition I wrote it down) to be Gennadius' mistake, (having never observed any saying of Origen tending this way,) and I do since find that Huetius<sup>t</sup> has proved it to be so. He must have mistaken it for another, which Origen did indeed hold, and which is in the consequence so near akin to this, that they are by Athanasius both condemned in one sentence. He held a præexistence (not of Christ's flesh, but) of his human soul.

He had imbibed from Plato's notions a fancy that all souls were created at the beginning : and then he thought it probable that in that præexistent state some of these souls behaved themselves better than others, and so were put into better bodies. And then (according to that rambling faculty that he had of building castles in the air, one on the top of another) he imagined that there might be some one soul among these, that might behave itself far better than any of the rest, and so might be chosen by God out of the rest to be assumed by the λόγος. To which sense he interprets Psalm xlv. 7 ; making it to be said to this soul, *Thou hast loved righteousness, &c. therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.* After which he finds out a great many pieces of work for this soul to do, before the time that it was united to the body that was born of the Virgin Mary.

The Christians of those elder times took great offence at his thus bringing the romantic notions of the heathen philosophers and the fictions of his own brain into the most sacred points of the Christian faith ; the main property whereof is, that it be kept whole, undefiled, unmixed, and unaltered, and (as Tertullian says) ' not to be mended.' And when his works came abroad in the world, there was for several ages a debate among the churches, whether they should receive his books, and honour his memory, as of a catholic Christian ; or hold both in execration, as of a heretic. And though the admiration they had of his great parts, learning, memory, pains, &c. (which were greater than had been in any Christian before, or perhaps have been

<sup>t</sup> [See Huetii Origeniana, lib. ii. cap. 2. quæst. 6. p. 92, 93.]



since,) and their love to the piety that he had shewn did much prejudice them in his favour; yet because of this and other heterodox tenets, he was by the greatest part condemned, (such a zeal the Christians of that time shewed against any one that went about to bring any alteration into their 'form of sound words,') but many on the other side did attempt apologies for him. The first and best of which is that which was drawn up by Pamphilus<sup>u</sup> the martyr, assisted by Eusebius, in six books.

Some of his tenets these apologists do endeavour to justify by giving a qualifying explication of them; and some that were imputed to him they shew to be imputed wrongfully. But this, which I have been speaking of, there is not one of them pretends to justify: but yet they say he ought not to be accounted a heretic, because he did not affirm it positively, or teach it dogmatically, or hold it obstinately; but only proposed it to the consideration of the hearers or readers, whether such a thing might not be. So Pamphilus (after he had endeavoured to refute the rest of the accusations against him from his own words) when he comes to this (which is the eighth of the nine capital errors there discussed) says<sup>x</sup>; 'I must make answer 'here myself.' The answer he makes is, 'that Origen knowing that 'that tenet of the soul is not plainly contained in the doctrine of 'the church, did (whenever some words of Scripture gave him occasion, or a hint rather, of disputing of it, and he did discuss and 'handle what seemed probable to him thereon) propose his thoughts 'to be judged of and approved by the readers, not defining any 'thing as a plain [or positive] point [dogma], or having the authority of an article [sententia], and did generally add to it such 'qualifying words as these; "If that account which I give of the 'soul do seem to any one to have any probability in it."' And that he never wrote any treatise particularly 'of the soul;' (as he had done of almost every thing else,) which Pamphilus says is a sign that he 'did not venture to define any thing dogmatically about it.'

This part of the apology is true. For whereas there are but two places in his works where he insists purposely on this præexistence of Christ's soul; one, *Contra Celsum*, lib. i; the other, *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, lib. ii. c. 6. (in other places he only touches it by the by): In the first of these he (as soon as he begins to talk of that matter of the præexistence of souls, upon which it is that he proceeds to speak of Christ's soul) admonishes the reader thus: 'I speak this according

<sup>u</sup> [See what remains of this work, in the Appendix to vol. iv. of the Benedictine edition of Origen's works, p. 17, &c.]

<sup>x</sup> Pamphili Apolog. prope finem. [p. 43.

edit. Benedict.]

<sup>y</sup> *Contra Celsum*, lib. i. p. 26. ed. Cant. [Sect. 32. Op. tom. i. p. 351. edit. Benedictin.]

‘to the notion of Pythagoras, Plato, and Empedocles, whom Celsus ‘often quotes.’ And in the latter of them, where he purposely insists on the article of Christ’s incarnation, he first confesses it to be a miracle and mystery, which it is beyond the power of the apostles, or even of the highest angels, to explain: but yet in the next words ventures on the explication of it, (which he gives to the purpose aforesaid, of a soul præexisting and united to the λόγος, and then incarnated,) but premises that he will not *define rashly* [*temeritate aliqua*], but propose rather *his own guesses* [or imaginations, *suspiciones nostras*] ‘than any positive affirmations.’ He does not say, ‘It ‘is every whit as clearly revealed as any article of faith whatsoever;’ or, ‘No Christian doctrine is more clearly delivered than is ‘this of my discourse.’

These excuses did alleviate, but not quite take off, the scandal taken at this innovation in the faith. When a man in his station, a presbyter of the church, does vent any such odd and singular fancy in religion; though he do it with never so much caution and declaration, that he is not positive in it, yet it always does some hurt, because of the inclination and itch that people have to catch at a newfangled opinion: and it cannot be so absurd, but that it will meet with some sorts of men, or women at least, whose brains stand awry in that particular enough to make them embrace it. It is always remembered among the heads of accusation afterward brought against him: and in that solemn and authoritative denunciation of him for a heretic given out by Theophilus, the patriarch of Alexandria<sup>z</sup>, as the præexistence of souls in general makes the first, so this præexistence of Christ’s soul in particular makes the sixth of the thirty-five errors there imputed to him. And the patriarch is particularly enraged at his perverting the sense of that text, Philipp. ii. 6, 7, *ἐκένωσεν εαυτὸν*, by giving a new interpretation of it adapted to his new hypothesis.

I believe Theophilus must have taken this from some book of his not now extant; for he never, as I remember, misapplies it so in those that are. He often applies that text, as other Christians do, to the λόγος. I will give an instance in the next chapter, § 10. And so for John i. 10. Col. i. 15, 16. He even in the midst of his dreams did never dream of a man-creator.

The place of Athanasius, where he condemns in one sentence, as I said, both this opinion of the human soul, and the other of the flesh,

<sup>z</sup> Epist. Paschal. i. [published in the fourth volume of the Benedictine edition

of St. Jerome’s Works, and at vol. i. p. 555, of that by Vallarsius.]

of Christ præexisting, is in his Epistle to Epictetus<sup>a</sup>: Εἰκότως καταγνώσονται ἑαυτῶν πάντες οἱ ρομίζοντες πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας εἶναι τὴν ἐξ αὐτῆς σάρκα, καὶ πρὸ ταύτης τινὰ ἐσχηκέναι ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην τὸν [Θεὸν] λόγον, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας ἀεὶ γεγεννησθαι. ‘So they will all ‘condemn themselves that think that Christ’s flesh was before Mary: ‘and that before her God the Word had a human soul, in which he ‘was before his coming into the world.’ God Almighty preserve to us the old Christian religion, and keep us in the love of it, and deliver us from all new ones, and from any such hankering after them as may argue our being weary of the old. But to return to the tenets of the English antipædobaptists.

6. Another opinion which they hold more generally, is the millenary opinion. They do, many of them, take that prophecy, Rev. xx. 4, 5, *of the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, &c. and which had not worshipped the beast, &c. living and reigning with Christ a thousand years*, in a proper sense: so as to reckon that the saints shall rise from the dead one thousand years before others shall. And they think that Christ will then come down, and be here upon the earth (though that be not said in the text) for that thousand years: and then, Satan being let loose to deceive the nations for some time, the general resurrection and the end of the world will be.

In the reciting and inculcating this doctrine to other people that are not of their way, many of them are apt, instead of saying, ‘The saints shall rise before the wicked,’ to say, ‘*We* shall rise before *you*.’

7. Another thing, which almost all the antipædobaptists in England do hold, is, that that decree of the apostles at Jerusalem, mentioned Acts xv. 29, *of abstaining from blood and from things strangled*, does still oblige all Christians. So they will eat of no such things.

In these two last-mentioned opinions they have many of the most ancient catholic Fathers on their side. And in the latter of the two, the Greek church has all along been, and still is<sup>b</sup>, of their opinion. The council in Trullo, which is accounted a general one, forbids ‘the making<sup>c</sup> of the blood of any animal into a sauce.’ And so does one of the ‘canons called *apostolic* forbid<sup>d</sup> the eating of blood, or ‘any thing strangled, or torn by beasts.’

8. They do, many of them, (but not all,) hold the opinion, which

<sup>a</sup> [See Athanasii Opera, edit. Benedictin. 2 tom. folio, Paris. 1698. tom. i. p. 907. sect. 8.]

<sup>b</sup> Sir Paul Ricaut, Hist. of Greek Church, chap. xx.

<sup>c</sup> Can. 67.

<sup>d</sup> Can. 63.



Calvin in a treatise on purpose<sup>e</sup> confutes, as held by the German antipædobaptists, and which by the foregoing account is said to be still held by the Minnists of Holland, from whom our antipædobaptists must have had it; that the soul sleeps, or is senseless, from the time of a man's death till the resurrection of his body.

This opinion is very wide from that of the primitive Christians; yet many of the most ancient of them held an opinion that is middle between this and that which is now commonly held. They held, that the soul at death goes not to heaven, (at least none but martyrs' souls,) but to *hades*; and that after the general resurrection the soul and body united again are received to heaven. That the souls of the patriarchs were in *hades*; and that Christ's soul went to *hades*. By *hades* they mean the general receptacle, or state, of souls good and bad till the resurrection; save that some few of them make *hades* the place of the bad, and Abraham's bosom of the good; but generally they speak of Abraham's bosom as one part of *hades*. So that it was counted a place or state quite different from heaven and from hell; as we English do commonly now understand the word hell.

It is great pity that the English translators of the Creed and of the Bible did not keep the word *hades* in the translation, as they have done some original words which had no English word answering to them. By translating it *hell*, and the English having no other word for *gehenna* (which is the place prepared for the Devil and the damned) than the same word *hell* likewise; it has created a confusion in the understanding of English readers. We say, *Christ descended into hell*. We ought to mean *hades*: for so it is in the Greek, *κατέβη εἰς ᾠδου*. And so St. Peter, Acts ii. 31, *His soul was not left, εἰς ᾠδου*, in *hades*. But when we read of *hell*, Matt. v. 20, 21. 29, 30, and such other places where the original word is *gehenna*, we ought to understand the *hell* of the damned. And the import of these two words in the original differs so much, that whereas all Christians ever believed that Christ descended into *hades*; yet if any had said, he descended into *gehenna*, he would have been accounted to blaspheme. And yet the English expresses both by the same word.

To give an account at once of all the places in the Bible where the word *hell* is used. Where we read *hell* in these texts following, it is in the original *gehenna*, or else *tartarus*; and ought to be understood, the *hell* of the damned. Matt. v. 22, 29, 30. x. 28; Luke xii. 5; Matt. xviii. 8, 9; Mark ix. 43—48; Matt. xxiii. 15, 33; James

<sup>e</sup> Psychopannychia, [published separately in 80. 1558; and in vol. vii. of the Collection of Calvin's Works, folio, Amsterdam, 1671.]

iii. 6; 2 Peter ii. 4. But where we read *hell* or *grave* in these texts following, the word is *hades*; and ought to be understood only, the state or receptacle of departed souls: or, in some of them, no more than in general a state of dissolution. Matt. xxi. 23; Luke x. 15; Matt. xvi. 18; Luke xvi. 23; Acts ii. 27, 31; 1 Cor. xv. 55, where it is translated *grave*. Rev. i. 18, item vi. 8, item xx. 13, 14. And in the Old Testament, wherever we read *hell*, it is to be understood *hades*. Jacob and David, &c. whenever they speak of their dying, call it their going to *sheol*, *hades*. Which words our English translates sometimes *hell*, sometimes *grave*, &c. And this shews St. Austin's observation to be a mistake; for he says<sup>f</sup>, that *infernum*, which is the translation of *hades* in many places, is never taken in Scripture in a good sense, or as the fate of a good man.

It is plain that Tertullian took it otherwise, by the following passages, beside many other. In his book *de Anima*, c. vii, he speaks of the different state of departed souls, receiving either 'torment in fire, or comfort in Abraham's bosom, *in carcere seu diversorio inferum*, in the prison or receptacle of Hades.' And in his book *de Idololat.* ch. xiii. he speaks of Lazarus being 'apud inferos in sinu Abrahamæ.' Which translated into English in our common way of speaking would be; in hell in Abraham's bosom. It must be translated *hades*.

Note, that in all the texts of the Revelation, death and *hades*, *θάνατος καὶ ᾄδης*, are joined together, and that at the general resurrection *death and hades deliver up the dead that are in them*, viz. to be tried at that great judgment; and then *death and hades are cast into the lake*, &c., i. e. there is to be no more death nor *hades*; but all is to be either heaven or hell, i. e. an eternal and unchangeable estate of woe or bliss.

Beside the places aforesaid, several, if not all, of the most ancient copies of the Acts of the Apostles had the word *ᾄδης*, in ch. ii. 24. For where we read, *having loosed the pains of death; for it was not*  
 67. *possible*, &c., they for *θανάτου* read *τοῦ ᾄδου*, *the pains of*  
 (A. D. 167.) *hades*. So reads Irenæus, lib. iii. ch. 12. St. Austin,  
 300. (A. D. 400.) *Epist.* 99, and other places. And Polycarp, *Epist. ad Philipp.*

Now the ancients did not think that the state of the soul in *hades* was to sleep, or be senseless. On the contrary, our Saviour in the parable, Luke xvi. 22, 23, represents Dives and Lazarus both in *hades*, (or one in *hades* and one in Abraham's bosom, if we take Abraham's bosom as out of *hades*,) but a great way off from one another, in very

<sup>f</sup> Epist. 99. [Epist. 164. sect. 7. in tom. ii. edit. Benedictin.]

different states; neither of them asleep, but one in torment, the other in repose. And all the ancients do instance in this parable as a proof that, before the general judgment, there will be a difference

100. made between the state of good men's souls and those of (A.D. 200.) wicked men. Tertullian<sup>g</sup> speaks of some who argued that there will be no judgment before the great one, when the soul and body shall be joined; and answers them; 'Quid ergo fiet in tempore isto? Dormiemus?' &c. 'What then shall we do in the mean time? Shall we be asleep? Souls do not sleep, not even

120. 'when they are in the bodies,' &c. And Eusebius<sup>h</sup> tells (A.D. 220.) of some heterodox people in Arabia, who held 'that the soul for the present dies together with the body, and is raised to life again together with it.' He says, Origen being sent thither presently convinced those people.

But as the foresaid Christians of these ancient times did not think that the soul sleeps; so neither were they, generally speaking, of the opinion that the souls of dying men go presently to heaven or to *gehenna*. I shall, for brevity, only recite what Justin Martyr and Irenæus do say. Justin in his dialogue<sup>i</sup> speaking of some heretics, οἱ λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ἅμα τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν, τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν: μὴ ὑπολάβητε αὐτοὺς Χριστιανούς. 'Who say there is no resurrection of the dead; but that when they die, their souls are taken up to heaven?' adds, 'Do not take these men for Christians.' And Irenæus in like manner had been saying<sup>k</sup>, that most of the heretics denied the resurrection of the body; but held instead of it, that when they died, their souls should presently fly away up to heaven; and that some erroneous catholics held with them in this latter tenet, though not in the former. He urges against them the example of our Saviour; 'Who,' says he, 'observed in himself the law of dead persons, and did not presently after his death go to heaven, but stayed three days in the place of the dead.' It is plain then, by the way, that he took that paradise where the thief was to be that day with our Saviour, to be not properly heaven, but a station in *hades*. Then a little after he argues thus; 'Whenas our Lord went into the midst of the shadow of death, where the souls of deceased persons abode; and then afterward rose again in the body, and was after his resurrection taken up to heaven; it is plain that the souls of his disciples, for whose sake the Lord did these things,

<sup>g</sup> De Anima, cap. ult.

<sup>h</sup> Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. ch. 37.

<sup>i</sup> [Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo, 8vo.

London, 1719; and in the editions of his Works, fol. 1722 and 1742.]

<sup>k</sup> Lib. v. cap. 31.



‘ shall go likewise to that invisible place appointed to them by God, and there abide till the resurrection, waiting for the time thereof; and afterward receiving their bodies, and rising again perfectly, i. e. in their bodies, as our Lord did, shall so come to the sight of God. *For the disciple is not above his master, but every one that is perfect shall be as his master.*’

‘ As therefore our Master did not presently fly up to heaven; but waiting till the time of his resurrection that was appointed by the Father, which had been foreshewn by Jonas; and rising the third day was so taken to heaven: so we must also wait the time of our resurrection appointed by God, which is foretold by the prophets; and so, rising again, be taken up, so many of us as the Lord shall account worthy.’

This, as might be shewn by many more quotations, was the most general opinion of those times. It is true indeed that some Fathers spoke of the soul as going directly to heaven; and that this became afterward the prevailing opinion in the western church; which is also affirmed in a Homily<sup>1</sup> of the Church of England, set forth in the time of Queen Elizabeth: so that it seems to have been the general opinion of the protestants in England at that time. But before the making of that homily, several of our first reformers declared against it; as Tyndal in his answer to sir Thomas More, and Frith in his answer to bishop Fisher<sup>m</sup>. And ever since the making of it, there have been, and still are, some divines of great note and station in that church, who do plainly enough shew their sentiment to be otherwise.

The reason given by the former, viz. Tyndal, Frith, &c. were to this purpose; that the placing of the soul in heaven does destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and St. Paul do prove the resurrection of the body. As when our Saviour proves that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall rise again in their bodies; because God, who is since their death called in Scripture *their God*, is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live to him: whereas, if Abraham’s soul had been then in heaven, that had been no proof that his body must arise; for God then might have been his God, though his body had not risen. And St. Paul proves to the Corinthians the resurrection, because else the Christians would be of all men most miserable, as having hope only in this life. And he comforts the Thessalonians concerning their friends departed, not by saying that they were gone to heaven, but that they should rise again at the

<sup>1</sup> Third part of the sermon concerning prayer.

<sup>m</sup> [See the works of Tyndal, Frith, and Barnes, folio, London, 1573.]

last day, and so go to heaven. That the opinion of separate souls going to heaven was the invention of the heathen philosophers, who knowing nothing of the resurrection, did so salve the hopes of a future state; and that some Christians (the papists, Tyndal says) had confounded and mixed the Christian and the heathen doctrine together. And again, if the souls be in heaven, ‘Tell me,’ says Tyndal, ‘why they be not in as good case as the angels be: and ‘then what cause is there of the resurrection?’ All this while these men would not determine in what state the separate souls really are: but Frith<sup>o</sup> says, ‘I dare be bold to say that they are in the hand of ‘God, and that God would that we should be ignorant where they ‘be, and not to take upon us to determine the matter.’ And Tyndal speaks to the same purpose, and adds concerning the souls of good men; ‘I believe they are in no worse case than Christ’s ‘soul was before his resurrection.’

To these reasons the later divines, of whom I spake, do add; that by the order of the last judgment, in Matt. xxv, and the pleas there used, and sentence there given, it should seem that the souls had not as yet been sentenced and sent either to heaven or hell. *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you, &c. Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, &c. For I was an hungred, &c. Lord, when saw we thee, &c.* And then afterward; *And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal, &c.* does not look as if they had been called out of heaven and hell to receive a sentence to go to heaven and hell; but that they had been till this time in expectation of their final sentence. Though the souls had been, (as these men do constantly hold against the antipædobaptists,) the bad ones in some degree of torment and horror, the good in a quiet repose and hopeful expectation, and as the office of burial says, ‘in joy and felicity.’ Or, as the ancients express it, *in refrigerio*.

To this may be added; that whereas the general hypothesis is, that the souls of the patriarchs were taken by Christ out of hades, and carried up with him into heaven at his ascension thither; St. Peter, on the contrary, preaching after Christ’s ascension, says expressly, Acts ii. 34, that David was not then ascended to heaven. The answer to which (being, I suppose, that David was not ascended to heaven in body, as Christ was, but his soul might be there) seems inconsistent with St. Peter’s reasoning at that place. For he is shewing that that saying of David, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades*, could not be understood of David himself, who was both

dead and buried, and his sepulchre then extant; but *that David, being a prophet, and seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hades*: where St. Peter seems to understand it, that David's soul was in hades (as well as his body in the sepulchre) to that day. The rest of their arguments I leave to be seen in their books.

But as to the antipædobaptists' opinion of the sleep of the soul; a late writer<sup>p</sup> that lives in a part of Kent that abounds with them, ascribes to some of them an opinion much worse than the ordinary one of the sleep of the soul till the resurrection. For he says, some of that sect have been heard to say, (and he believes it is the private tenet of others of them,) 'That infants dying before actual sin, their souls consume with their bodies; and they die never to be any more. Therefore they forbear the giving of baptism, as unnecessary for them.' I hope and believe that this can be the opinion of but very few, and those some ignorant people, among them. And I am lately assured by a man<sup>q</sup> of chief note among them, that he never knew any one man of any sort of them that held this. And indeed since our Saviour shewed such a concern and tender regard for infants, saying withal, *Of such is the kingdom of heaven*: and since God and nature have implanted in the heart of all pious parents such an earnest desire of the eternal good of their infants: it is an unnatural thought, that neither that concern of our Saviour, nor that desire of godly parents, shall ever have any satisfaction in the case of such infants as die; but that one must despair of them, as persons that will be lost for ever, notwithstanding any means that can be used for their salvation. P. S. One party of the antipædobaptists do deny any sleep of the soul. And I have it from good hands, that they that do now hold it are but few in comparison, and such as are accounted of the more ignorant sort.

9. Many of the antipædobaptists in England are said to be against any singing of Psalms in divine worship. I recited before<sup>r</sup>,  
 1040. out of Petrus Cluniacensis, that the Petrobrusians held  
 (A. D. 1140.) that 'it is a mocking of God to sing in the church.' And the Lyonists said, 'it is a hellish noise.' I believe the disgust  
 1040. taken at that time was against the excessive regard then  
 (A. D. 1140.) given in the popish churches to the sound and music, which hindered the attention to the sense of the prayers. But to condemn all singing of praise to God, is a thing too contrary to the Scrip-

<sup>p</sup> Case of an Infant dying unbaptized, page 18.

<sup>q</sup> [Mr. Stennet. See Defence, p. 170.]

<sup>r</sup> Chap. vii. § 5.



tures both of the Old and New Testament. Some of them do not dislike singing in general; but say that the Psalms of David are not so proper now, as some that may be composed on purpose for the use of the Christian church. And some others of them are not at all against singing, any more than other Christians are. And it grows of late to be more and more in use with them. Though many of them formerly have scrupled the use of Psalms, as sung by the whole congregation jointly; yet of late that humour is in great degree worn off: and the practice of singing David's Psalms, and in the way that other people do, has generally obtained among them.

10. The same may be said of the use of the Lord's Prayer. Many of them do, out of an odd and unaccountable humour, reject the use of it. But though this be an imputation laid by some people on the whole body of them, yet I know that some of them, and believe that most of them, do both use it, and teach their children to use it. The Petrobrusians, as well as all the other sorts of the Waldenses, extolled the use of it.

11. So for extreme unction of the sick, spoken of James v. 14, 15, Mr. Russen of Hythe in Kent, a place that is full of these people, says<sup>s</sup>; 'I am sure it is both their opinion and practice, as to some, though probably all do not use it.'

P. S. This I find to be confessed since by Mr. Stennet. But he tells me, it is but rarely practised: and that not (as the papists use it) only or chiefly in cases desperate; but mostly in hopes of recovery, and for that end.

12. Mr. Russen mentions also<sup>t</sup> a way of marriage used among them, not according to the use of the church of England, and so of doubtful validity in the law of the land. And he says, 'This was introduced to give room for the Jesuits and Romish priests to take women: for they being prohibited marriage, and accounting marriage one of the seven sacraments, durst not take a wife, or be married after the manner of either the Romish or English church, &c. but would take women in the congregations of anabaptists or Quakers.' But he (though writing against them something angrily) confesses, and it is a known thing, that 'many of them are married at our churches: but more,' he says, 'in their private assemblies.' But this, all of them, that I can speak with, deny to be true in matter of fact. They are for the most part married in the church. That scruple diminishes among them.

<sup>s</sup> [See David Russen's *Fundamentals without a Foundation*; or a true Picture of the Anabaptists, chap. viii. p. 60.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. page 58.

13. Their way of receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is in a posture that shews, outwardly at least, less of devotion than the way of most other Christians. They receive it sitting at a common table, and (as the foresaid writer expresses it) 'with the hat on, and 'handing the elements one to another'.

P.S. I find since that the hat on is denied: the sitting confessed.

14. Some of them are Sabbatarians, i. e. they hold it still necessary, even for the Gentile Christians, to keep every Saturday as a Sabbath-day. One Bampfield<sup>x</sup>, a man of note among them, formerly wrote a treatise on that subject, wherein he has, they say, said more for it than one could imagine could be said for so heterodox a tenet. There are however in the country few or none of this opinion; what are, are at London. Whether the same men do keep the Lord's-day too, I know not.

15. They differ more among themselves about the practice of Confirmation, or laying on of hands after baptism. Some of them do wholly omit and reject the use of that ordinance, as being popish, or having no foundation in Scripture, or at least not now to be continued. And this it seems was the way of those churches or societies of them, that in the times I spoke of, did first <sup>1544.</sup> (A.D. 1644.) openly set up at London. Others of them account it a necessary thing. And some of these latter making it an order among themselves, as the church of England does, that none shall be admitted to the holy communion, until such times as he be confirmed, (the church of England adds, 'or be ready and desirous to be confirmed,') there necessarily follows a breach of communion between the two parties. And therefore Danvers<sup>y</sup> says, 'must not all those churches of that constitution (which require this ordinance) necessarily be supposed to be founded in sin and schism, as well as in great error and ignorance?' He says, 'It doth not appear that any baptized church or people did ever in any age or country own such a principle or practice to this day, except some in <sup>1546.</sup> 'this nation in these late times.' And gives this account (A.D. 1646.) of the rise of it; 'That about the year 1646, one Mr. Cornwell, heretofore a public preacher, then a member and min-

<sup>u</sup> Page 57.

<sup>x</sup> [See a work entitled, 'The Judgment of Mr. Francis Bamfield late minister of Sherborne in Dorsetshire, for the observation of the Jewish or seventh-day Sabbath, &c. in a letter to Mr. Benn of Dorchester. Together with Mr. Benn's sober answer to the same.' 12<sup>o</sup>. London, 1672. See also a piece of Mr. Thomas Bampfield, 'on the

'Sabbath,' printed for the author, 1692: 'Dr. Wallis' Defence of the Christian Sabbath in answer to the foregoing treatise,' 4<sup>o</sup>. Oxford, 1692: and Thomas Bampfield's 'Reply to Dr. Wallis,' 4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1693.]

<sup>y</sup> Treatise of Laying on of Hands, Conclusion. [page 56. 57: This piece is subjoined to his Treatise of Baptism, 8<sup>o</sup>. 1674.]

‘ister of a baptized congregation in Kent,—coming into that baptized congregation then meeting in the Spittle, Bishopsgate-street, London, preached the necessity of laying on of hands; inferring from thence that those who were not under laying on of hands, were not babes in Christ, &c. Whereupon several were persuaded, &c. and made a rent and a separation:—and from that very schism propagated the same principle and practice among many others in the nation ever since.’ But this account of Danvers is looked on by the moderate men that are now among them, to be no just one. They say, that the most of those that do now use confirmation, admit to the communion and receive as brethren those that scruple the using it: and *à contra*.

16. As to the point of prædestination: those of them that are of the Arminian opinion, they call *the general men*; as holding a general and universal redemption by Christ: and the Calvinists they call *the particular men*, as holding a particular and absolute redemption of some particular persons.

I had said in my first edition, that they generally made a different opinion about this to be a bar against communion one with another. Some of them do tell me, that this is not general; but only the temper of some hot and eager spirits on both sides: that the country where I dwell, is full of such of them as are of the least repute; but that the major part of their elders or rulers all over England do now admit either sort. I am glad if this last be in fact the truer account of the generality of them: for (as I said then) if the church of Christ be never to be one, till all Christians do explain themselves alike in the nice disputes that happen in reconciling God’s præscience and prædestination with man’s freewill; it will never be one in this world. All protestants that make divisions on this account, should learn wit from our common enemies. They, though they do in their books carry this dispute to the height, yet do keep themselves from separation for it: in which practice they are, both in point of interest and of duty, certainly in the right.

The antipædobaptists may be sure I am not their enemy, when I note this their humour of dividing from one another, as an imprudent thing. For as it is the interest of the great enemy of mankind that Christians should be divided as much as is possible; and of the papists, that protestants should be so: so whoever were an enemy to these men in particular, would wish to see ten parties or divisions for every one that is among them.

17. Many (but it seems not all) of *the general men* are Pelagians



in the point of original sin. They own nothing of it. The other do: as appears both by the ‘confession of faith’<sup>z</sup> of seven churches of them, which I mentioned before; and also by their present profession. Some of the general men say, they wonder how these that own sin in infants can be against their baptism. The Pelagians, that owned no sin in infants, yet granted the necessity of their baptism to obtain the kingdom of heaven; these believe they have sin, yet they deny them baptism for the forgiveness of it.

18. Socinians they have some that creep in among them: but I have not heard of any church or congregation of them that makes profession of that doctrine; but, on the contrary, that they that profess it openly are rejected from their communion. And as much as I have said against their divisions, I do not see how they that worship and believe in Christ as God, can join with them that either renounce the worship of him, or believe him to be only a creature lately made, and even still to be, in the best nature that he has, of finite worth, dignity, and capacity.

A late confession, published in the name of one hundred churches of them, shews those churches to be catholic as to the faith of the Trinity. But yet some printed papers, of much the same date with that confession, passing between some of their congregations, do shew that there are great scandals given or taken by some of them against others on account of Socinian tenets. There are some of these papers signed by several of their messengers, elders, and representatives, and printed 1699, renouncing that assembly of anti-pædobaptists, which they call the *General Assembly*, held at Goswell-street, London, and persuading others to do the like; saying, that it is to the reproach of Jesus Christ and the pollution of the churches to hold communion with that assembly: and that it is inconsistent for any who hold the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ to do so.

But all this is not (as far as I can learn) that they charge the General Assembly with Socinian tenets; but only with refusing to turn out some that are accused of holding them: which accusations they think to be fully proved; but the others, it seems, say they are not.

Since my first edition, there is printed in 1706, a Socinian pamphlet, entitled, ‘The Unreasonableness of making and imposing ‘Creeds.’ It is without a name; but the author seems to be an anti-pædobaptist, that is angry with two parties of his brethren, one

called, *the General Assembly*, the other, *the General Association*. Which, as he represents, having been at some variance, did on June 9, 1704, unite on the following terms:

First, they set down two articles of faith concerning God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ; containing an orthodox confession of the Trinity, and being much of the same sense as are the first two of the Thirty-nine Articles of the church of England. [This he calls a specimen of *modern creed-making*.]

Then they enact, that if any of their members shall publish or say any thing contrary to that faith, he shall be 'esteemed disorderly, 'and dealt with accordingly.' But they add, that if any member receiving this faith, shall reflect on any member that does not receive it (provided he do not teach the contrary), he also 'shall be 'esteemed disorderly, and dealt with accordingly.'

And on these terms, 'that the Assembly and Association do presently meet together as formerly, and unite.' And they enact, 'that all papers that have been published, relating to any difference 'between them, be suppressed.' I suppose they had in their eye the papers that I spoke of.

Upon which this author observes, that 'they that have not throats 'wide enough to swallow this rough creed, must not tell their reason 'why. But if they will hold their tongues and only think, they 'shall have the favour not to be reflected on.' Upon which he falls into a vein of the vilest raillery, burlesque, buffoonery, and mockery of the doctrine of the Trinity, that this impious age has produced. And it has produced a great deal; too much in all conscience to be borne with. That Socinian doctrine seems to have infected all its disciples (this antipædobaptist as well as the pædobaptist ones) with such a degree of searedness, that they do no longer discourse in any serious way; but, as if they were talking of some play or jest, make themselves sport with the awful mystery of *God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit*. And since they cannot argue, would laugh us out of our faith. One would think that if their consciences urge them to argue against the God of the Christians, they should in a Christian nation be compelled to do it with less effrontery and impudence.

These antipædobaptists, as he tells us afterward, met again in 1705, and agreed that none should be a member of the 'General 'Assembly,' (which, it seems, is a body made up of the representatives of particular churches,) 'unless he do subscribe the whole of 'the foresaid draught of 1704.' So that no Socinian can be chosen

a representative [or proctor] to sit in the General Assembly: for which he is very angry with them, though all the world beside must think it but a necessary caution.

At last, he tells them in a laughing way, that ‘to make any ‘canons without the queen’s license is a *præmunire*.’ Which is, I suppose, brought in to insult, and triumph over, the Convocation of the church of England, for its being under such restraint: whereas these bodies of men do in their assemblies make and publish any rules that they think needful on any emergent occasion; and do actually inflict and execute their church censures on such of their members as do not observe them.

19. They are generally much inclined to hold public disputations about religion before the multitude. Having plain places of Scripture to produce concerning adult-baptism, and several examples of it; they work much on such of the people as had not minded this before, and had not had a right state of the question between the *pædobaptists* and the *antipædobaptists*: wherein the former grant that in a nation newly converted to Christianity, (and such are all the cases mentioned in the Scripture,) the adult people must be baptized first, before their infants can be baptized.

Their most eager disputes are against the Quakers. And they have reason. For since so great a part of their zeal is spent in setting the time and manner of baptism right, as they judge: and it happens among them (as indeed the like does among all parties) that there are some that have little religion beside their zeal in that matter: the Quaker gives them the foulest affront possible. He cuts off all their religion at one stroke; saying that all water-baptism, at what age soever it be given, is an useless thing: and perverts all the places of Scripture where it is spoken of, with some farfetched interpretations; as he does likewise in the case of the other sacrament. And though among people of sense that do own the Scripture, (as some at least of the Quakers do,) one would think that this dispute should quickly be at an end; yet it is strange to observe what numbers there do continue in many places of England of that enthusiastical sect, that can turn the plainest places of Scripture into a riddle.

It is a great discredit to the climate and air of England, that that sort of distemper of brain that disposes men to Quakerism should be nowhere so epidemical as there. The same men in the popish religion would have been visionary saints, hermits, Carthusians, &c. In the Indian religion they would have been Ghebers<sup>a</sup>, and their

<sup>a</sup> See Mr. Thevenot’s Travels into Persia.



cant now is much like the other's Ghiberish. In the Mahometan, they would have been of those dervises that have raptures of crying *Allah, Allah*, till their heads grow giddy, and they fall down. If the sets of opinions for the late sects have, as some think, been contrived by the Jesuits; that Jesuit that contrived this, shewed so dull a faculty for the work, that he might, one would have thought, have despaired of any disciples: and yet it is become one of the most spreading in England. A late author says<sup>b</sup>, he has been credibly informed that a St. Omer's Jesuit declared, that they were twenty years hammering out the sect of the Quakers. It is strange they could not forge nor smoothe it any handsomer. For as all poetry, fiction, or play, ought to represent, if not true history, yet something that may look, or be conceived, like it; so they that would frame a religion pretending to be founded on the Scripture, or to be believed together with it, should dress it up with tenets that have some appearance of likeness to the declarations of Scripture; and not make it to renounce such things as the Scripture does enjoin in so plain words as it does the two sacraments. But there is a sort of people that take a malicious pleasure in trying how broad affronts the understanding of some men will bear.

It is the vulgar people among the Quakers that we speak of as thus led by the nose, and possessed with this sort of enthusiasm. Their leaders and the politic men among them (if they be not of the foresaid hammerers) seem to have for the bottom of their religion, deism; and to think that reason and human philosophy is a better rule for a man to direct his conversation by, than any tradition or revealed doctrine. For what other than such is the consequent of that principle; that *the light within us*, which comes at last to be no other than our own reason, is better than *any light without us*, i. e. than any Scripture?

20. The English antipædobaptists have for their church-government, Elders, or Presbyters: these have a ruling power in the congregations. Deacons; these take care of the poor. Teachers; any whom the congregation approves of for that purpose, as fit to teach: so of these they have abundance. Yet those congregations of them that are accounted the most regular, do not appoint or suffer any (that are not yet ordained elders) to preach publicly, but only in a probational way, in order to be ordained if they continue to be approved: except on some case of necessity, as in the want of elders, &c. They have some whom they call *messengers*, which is the

<sup>b</sup> Foxes and Firebrands, part i. p. 4., [by Robert Ware, 4<sup>o</sup>. 1680, 8vo. 1682-1689.]

English word for *apostles*. And there are of these two sorts. Some are such of their presbyters, as being found of the best ability, judgment, &c. are appointed (beside the care of their own congregation) to go sometimes about a certain district, diocese, or province. And when any of these come to preach in any other man's congregation, or to be present at any meeting of their churches; he is received and heard with greater respect than ordinary, and his authority more regarded than of ordinary presbyters. But for direct and proper jurisdiction over other presbyters or people, he has none: nor any power of ruling but in his own congregation. The other sort is of such as are nothing else but messengers in the ordinary sense of the English word: viz. men appointed as messengers to carry the sense and opinion of some congregations to other congregations at a distance.

They have some whom they call *representatives*: i. e. men chosen and delegated by the particular churches that they have all over England, to meet at London every Whitsuntide, to consider of the common affairs of their religion. This meeting of representatives, is, as I take it, that which is called the *General Assembly*; something resembling our lower house of Convocation. The place is in Goswell-street, London. But one congregation does sometimes send two or three representatives.

All these are chosen with the approbation of the people: only the people themselves are in their approbation much swayed by the advice of their messengers, elders, &c. and by the opinion which they give concerning the fitness of any one. And then they are ordained by the laying on of an elder's hands.

They do, in the disputes which they hold with people of the church of England, frequently urge that this their way, viz. for the people to have their suffrage in the choice of church-officers, is the most regular way; as being that which was used by the primitive Christians. Which is a piece of history that cannot fairly be denied. It was certainly the primitive way for the bishop to choose the presbyters with the approbation of the people: and for the presbyters and people together, being for the most part assisted by some neighbouring bishops, to choose a new bishop in the room of one that died. This continued for many hundred years: and those Christians that have gone about to mend this way have made it much worse.

But the antipædobaptists have upon the whole no reason to boast of the regularity of their management in this matter. For whereas the primitive practice was, as I said, for the bishop to choose the

presbyters with the approbation of the people; the antipædobaptists, as they have preserved and increased the privilege of the people, have quite shut out the office of a bishop, (for by the foregoing account, the messenger has not any of the power of a bishop,) which of the two is the more necessary. For the multitude, partly for want of judgment concerning the fitness of any one, and partly by their inclination to faction and party, and being *puffed up for one against another*<sup>c</sup>, are found by woful experience, in all churches where that way is used, to be wretched choosers for themselves. The original and primitive pattern is the best.

21. They have this way of adjusting differences that arise among themselves on account of trespasses, dues, or other money matters; which I recite as being worthy of imitation. If any one of them does wrong to another, or refuses to do or to pay what is equitable in any case: if he will not be brought to reason by a private arguing of the matter, nor by the verdict of two or three neighbours added; the plaintiff brings the case before the congregation, when they with their elder are assembled in the nature of a vestry. And in difficult cases, there lies an appeal from a particular congregation to some fuller meeting of their church under a messenger. And he of the two that will not stand to the ultimate determination of the assembly by their usage appointed, is no longer acknowledged by the rest as a brother.

As this is very much according to our Saviour's<sup>d</sup> and St. Paul's<sup>e</sup> direction in such cases; so I have been told that it has the good effect to prevent abundance of lawsuits, and end many quarrels: very few of them offering to withstand the general verdict and opinion of all their brethren. And there is no reason to doubt but that a like course would, if it were put in practice, have a like good effect among other societies of Christians.

22. The like discipline (of renouncing brotherhood) they use against such of their communion as are known to be guilty of any such immorality, as is a scandal to the Christian profession of a sober and godly life: for which care of their members there is no man but will commend them. And therefore I do not mention the ordering of this as particular in them: all churches by their constitution do order the same thing to be done. But the administration, or putting in execution of this order, is in some churches very slack and negligent; and in some, very much perverted by corrupt officers of the courts. The bishop's visiting of every parish in particular (which when it began first to be omitted by some bishops,

<sup>c</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 6.<sup>d</sup> Matt. xviii. 15, 16, 17.<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 1, 2, &c.



was so earnestly enjoined by canons<sup>f</sup>) is now almost antiquated and forgotten. And there is many times a very huddling work made of a visitation.

So far as this discipline is omitted or perverted in any church; so far is that church fallen into a very dangerous decay. Among all the exceptions made by the several sorts of dissenters against the church of England, there is none nigh so material as this: nor is there any neglect, the amending whereof would, beside the stopping of the mouths of gainsayers, produce a greater spiritual advantage to their people. In the meantime the dissenters ought to consider and allow these things following:

1. That this is much more difficult in a national church than in one of their societies. For none side with them but what do it out of some zeal: whether it be a true and godly zeal, or an ignorant and factious one; still it is zeal, and may be made use of to a vigorous execution of the orders passed among them. But there is in all nations, besides the zealous men, a sort of ‘flying squadron,’ that have really no concern at all for any religion, but being perfectly indifferent, do of course fall in with the national church, as being the most fashionable at that time. These, wherever they light, are a great hinderance to the due execution of any canons for discipline. They are, either by their riches and power too big, or else by their number too many, for the force of the law. The dissenters, notwithstanding the boasts of their exactness of discipline, would find themselves embarrassed if this were their case.

2. That though the Scripture does command churches to excommunicate wicked men, yet it does not allow private men to make separations from a church that does not duly practise that command. Let a man but take care that he do not deserve by his own wickedness to be turned out of the church; and if others who do deserve it, be not, upon a motion made, turned out, that is not his fault, nor will be imputed to him. The church of Corinth was faulty in this, when St. Paul wrote his first Epistle to them: and though he does there reprove them for this fault; yet at the time of his second Epistle, there were still many wicked men<sup>h</sup> whom they had not yet turned out; and yet in both his Epistles<sup>i</sup> he charges that none go about to make any division. And from that time to this time, there has been no church free from these ‘spots in the feasts of charity.’ It is indeed impossible for any church, while it is in this world, ab-

<sup>f</sup> See Bochetti Decreta Eccles. Gall. lib. v. tit. 15. c. 2, 5, 9, &c. Item, Bishop Stillingfleet's Charge at his Primary Visi-

tation, page 54, &c.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. v. 2.

<sup>h</sup> 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 11, 12.

solutely to free itself. In the mean time, private Christians are advised to withdraw their familiarity<sup>k</sup> and conversation from those that they know to be such. And so far, every private man has the power of excommunication in his own breast.

3. That whereas there are but four sorts of men whom the Scripture does command to be excommunicated: 1. Idolaters<sup>l</sup>, unbelievers<sup>m</sup>, teachers of false doctrine in the fundamentals<sup>n</sup> of the faith; 2. Men of vicious and immoral lives<sup>o</sup>; 3. Such as in points of trespasses or differences between man and man will not hear the church<sup>p</sup>; and fourthly, those that make divisions in or from a church:—the dissenters and dividing parties should, amidst all the zeal that they shew for executing the law upon the first three sorts, remember that the law is as full, as plain, as peremptory against the fourth sort as against any of the other. For there is not a text in all the Scripture that is plainer against any sin, or that does more expressly command any sort of sinners to be excommunicated, than is that of St. Paul, Rom. xvi. 17; *Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.* Therefore he that thinks adultery to be a sin, and drunkenness to be a sin, &c. and schism to be none; or that a man is to be avoided or excommunicated for the one, but not for the other; is one that does not take Christ's commands as they lie in Scripture, but picks out some that he will observe, and others that he will slight, according as they please or displease his humour. The word of God is, that every one should avoid, or separate from him that goes about to make a separation. The dissenters, if they apply this, will be inclined to a little more moderation and charity in the censures that they pass upon national churches, for their want of so severe a discipline as they call for.

23. The English antipædobaptists have, as the other separating parties in England have, some Jesuits, that in disguise do ever now and then strive to insinuate and get in among them. This society did at first exert the chief of their strength, and employ the ablest men they had, in writing books of controversy against the protestants: and they had the repute of having puzzled the cause better than any other popish writers had. This way, however unfairly managed by them, had yet this commendation; that it was fighting in open field. But having been there repulsed with some loss, it is now a long time since, that they have wholly taken to that way which Dr.

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. v. 11.<sup>l</sup> 2 Cor. vi. 16, 17.<sup>m</sup> 2 Cor. xiv. 15.<sup>n</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 16, 17, 18.<sup>o</sup> 1 Cor. v. 7, 12.<sup>p</sup> Matt. xviii. 17.

Stillington, thirty years ago<sup>q</sup>, called their ‘present way of pickering and lying under hedges.’ They will turn themselves into any shape, pretend to be of any religion, put on the disguise of tradesmen, handicraftsmen, soldiers, physicians, &c. to get an opportunity either of making proselytes to the church of Rome, or of promoting divisions among protestants. But there is no employment they love so well, as that of a preacher in any of the separate congregations. They can act this part notably. They stick not in their sermons to rail as fiercely as any against the pope of Rome, so that they may use the credit, which they thereby get with the deluded people, to engage them deeper in principles of separation from the established church of the countries where they live. Sometimes they have been detected in their lifetimes; and sometimes the cheat has not appeared till a good while after.

The author of a book called *Foxes and Firebrands*<sup>r</sup> has collected out of histories, records, letters, &c. abundance of instances wherein they have been found instilling or inflaming principles of separation among all the sects or divided parties in England and Scotland ever since the reformation. And out of him the author of a book, called *The Picture of the Anabaptists*<sup>s</sup>, has recited such, wherein they have been concerned with the antipædobaptists. I shall not here repeat them.

One instance, which shews how long it is sometimes before the intrigue is discovered, is this: in the former years of queen Elizabeth’s time, there were a sort of people called Puritans, that expressed some dislike at some orders or ceremonies of the church of England; but yet did not proceed to separation, but, on the contrary, declared an abhorrence of it. But about the year <sup>1467.</sup> (A.D. 1567.) 1567, ‘there succeeded them (as Fuller relating the matter expresses it)<sup>t</sup> ‘another generation of active and zealous nonconformists. Of these Coleman, Button, Hallingham, and Benson ‘were the chief: inveighing against the established church-discipline: accounting every thing from Rome, which was not from ‘Geneva: endeavouring in all things to conform the government of ‘the English church to the presbyterian reformation.’

Camden<sup>u</sup> and Heylyn<sup>x</sup> do mention the same men with the same character: as opposing the discipline, Liturgy, calling of our bishops as approaching too near to the church of Rome, &c.

Now neither Camden, Heylyn, nor Fuller, who recite the names

<sup>q</sup> Discourse concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome, preface. [This work was published in the year 1676, 80.]

<sup>r</sup> [Robert Ware: see above, p. 558.]

<sup>s</sup> [David Russen: see above, p. 552.]

<sup>t</sup> Ch. History, lib. ix. [sect. 9. p. 81.]

<sup>u</sup> Annal. Elizab. ad ann. 1568.

<sup>x</sup> History of Presbyter. book vi. p. 257.



of these men, ever knew any thing to the contrary, but that they were really such as they pretended, viz. protestants puritanically inclined: much less did the people that were led into separation by them know any thing.

<sup>1585.</sup> But a hundred years after the time that these men and (A.D. 1685.) their first associates must have been dead, viz. about twenty years ago, it was discovered that three of the four, viz. Hallingham, Coleman, and Benson, were Jesuits; and that, by the sagacity of bishop Stillingfleet<sup>y</sup> comparing the histories of those times with some Jesuits' letters intercepted about the same time.

The chief letter to this purpose is recited by the foresaid author of Foxes and Firebrands<sup>z</sup>, and averred by him to be 'a true copy ' taken out of the registry of the episcopal see of Rochester, in that ' book which begins anno 2 and 3 Philip and Mary, and is continued ' to 15 Eliz.'

<sup>1468.</sup> What he recites from that book is to this purpose. In the (A.D. 1568.) year 1568, one Heth went about the lower parts of Kent, preaching up division and a purer reformation: he came to Rochester, and they, not knowing what seditious doctrines he had preached in the country places, admitted him to preach in the cathedral. The next day there was found in the pulpit a letter that had dropped from him, written to him from one Malt, a Jesuit at Madrid, (which is there recited at large,) applauding the course he took, and advertising him of the success of some others sent on the like errand: and adding these words: ' Hallingham, Coleman, and Benson have set ' a faction among the German heretics, so that several who have ' turned from us have now denied their baptism.' This and other evidences being brought, he was convicted in the bishop's court at Rochester to be a Jesuit, and could not any longer deny it. In his boots were found his beads, and a pope's bull for the Jesuits to preach what doctrine they pleased for dividing of protestants, particularly naming the English. And in his trunk were several books for denying baptism to infants.

The author of this recital makes no use of this passage of the letter about Hallingham, Coleman, and Benson. But bishop Stillingfleet shews, that they must have been the same men mentioned by the foresaid historians: and that by German heretics are meant any protestants; that religion being then called the German heresy.

The book from whence this is quoted must probably have been then in the registry, because the said author (who was accounted a man of credit) would not else so positively have referred to it. But

I understand by inquiry that it is not now there. By what interest it can have been taken away since that time, (which was about thirty years ago,) is hard to guess. But however, it seems that Mr. Russen, who says<sup>a</sup> at present, ‘if they look upon this story as un-true, let them search the register, &c. where they shall find to their ignominy the verity thereof,’ is mistaken.

P. S. Since the writing of this, I understand that it is said to have been stolen away in the late king James’ time. A neighbour clergyman, the reverend and learned Mr. Edward Brown, rector of Sundrish in Kent<sup>b</sup>, now deceased, was told so by an old officer of the church of Rochester. And he left a memorandum of it in writing with Dr. Barker, rector of Brasthead, who since Mr. Brown’s death told me he had it. But the persons are now all dead, and the written memorandum is lost.

I shall mention but one case more; and that is one which is not taken notice of by theforesaid collectors. All that I understand of it is from a pamphlet printed by one Everard in the year 1664. By which it appears that he in Cromwell’s time had been a captain of horse, and a noted preacher against infant-baptism. He speaks as if he had had a great many converts. This time at which he printed his pamphlet was a time in which it was impossible for him to carry on that trade in a disguise any longer. So he faces about, and endeavours to decoy them over with him to the church of Rome. To this purpose he pretends that it had pleased God to bring him to an opportunity of discoursing concerning religion with a very grave and judicious gentleman, who ‘examining every thing from the bottom, and laying the axe to the root of the tree, &c. asked him ‘in the first place, whether he was sure and certain, that the Christian religion in general was more true than the religion of the Turks, Jews,’ &c. In short, this man had by degrees made him see that there is no firm reliance for one’s faith either on the Scripture, or on the direction of the Spirit, or on reason; but only on the authority of the catholic church, by which he all along means the church of Rome. So he gives to his pamphlet this title; ‘An Epistle to the several Congregations of the Nonconformists: by Capt. Robert Everard, now by God’s grace a member of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ: shewing the Reasons of his Conversion and Submission to the said Catholic Church,’ printed 1664<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. vii.

<sup>b</sup> [In the ‘Additions and Alterations in the third edition, &c.’ appended to his ‘Defence,’ Dr. Wall had added here the words, ‘who was born and bred at Rochester.’]

<sup>c</sup> [This work was printed at Paris, and consists of forty pages in quarto. The Bodleian library possesses a copy formerly belonging to bishop Barlow, and containing a few MS. notes by him.]

But the reasons therein given are so exactly the same with the ordinary sophisms which the Jesuits commonly use to amaze and confound the minds of ignorant people, and the writer of them sets them forth with so much of the same sort of art; that he that reads the book will easily discern, that Everard was not now converted, but was a papist before.

We must think that the instances of this nature that have been discovered are probably but few in comparison with those that never have been so. We oftener find where these men have been, than where they are: and it were happy for England, if they had some mark, whereby they might be known.

There is one tenet of the antipædobaptists in which the Jesuits concur with them, not only when they are in this disguise, but also in their late books to which they set their names: that is, ‘that infant-baptism cannot be proved from Scripture.’ The old books of the papists, and even of some Jesuits, do, as well as the books of protestants, prove it by arguments from Scripture, as archbishop Laud and Vossius have largely shewn<sup>d</sup>. But the late Jesuits have given a politic turn to that point of the Romish doctrine, and say, that it can be proved only by the custom and tradition of the church. They serve two designs by this device. One is, to puzzle the protestants in general, who maintain that the Scripture is a sufficient rule. The other is, to encourage the antipædobaptists that are among the protestants, in their opinion and separation. To which purpose they do in their books furnish them with answers to all the arguments brought from Scripture.

Col. Danvers says<sup>e</sup>, ‘A great papist, lately in London, going to a dispute about infants’ baptism, told his friend, he was “going to hear a miracle, viz. infants’ baptism to be proved by Scripture.”’

And one E. P. an antipædobaptist preacher, formerly of Deptford, now, I think, about Dover in Kent, in a pamphlet which he entitles, *A threepenny Answer, &c.* has this remark<sup>f</sup>, ‘A popish priest confest to a minister of the baptized way, that “there is no Scripture for baptizing infants: but yet it ought to be done, because the church has commanded it.” This was a true and ingenious confession.’ There is no doubt but this priest would, if Mr. P. had given leave, have preached the same in his congregation. And if he might have preached in a vizard, would have said it ought not to be done at all.

But I do not so much wonder at these two, as I do at Mr. Stennet,

<sup>d</sup> [In his treatise ‘De Baptismo,’ Op. om. vi. folio.]

<sup>e</sup> Treatise of Baptism, second ed. p. 134.

<sup>f</sup> Page 25.



who, in his late Answer to Mr. Russeng, has thought fit to strengthen his cause not only by quoting cardinal Perron, Fisher the Jesuit, &c. but has spent eleven whole pages in giving us an harangue of Mr. Bossuet, a late popish author, written in favour of the antipædobaptists. Is it news to Mr Stennet too, that the papists for these eighty years past do this against their own conscience, and out of a design against the protestants in general? If it be, let him consult and compare the popish writers, and he will find that before that time they do themselves all of them prove infant-baptism by Scripture, and that it is only the later ones that have altered their tale. There seems to have been about that time a consult of the Jesuits, wherein it was resolved to give this cue to the writers of their side. Cardinal Perron began this course: and the learned Rivet even then smelled the design, and gave the world notice of it, as I shewed ch. ii. § 9. Yet even still the papists carry it on in new writings every day: and it takes, it seems, (not only as Saffold's bills do with the new folks that come to town every year, but) even with some of the wiser sort. If the discourse that he recites so at length, had any thing of new argument in it; it might be used, come it from whom it would. But there is nothing of that, but what is common, and even trivial, and has been answered a hundred times. It affirms that infant-baptism depends solely on the tradition of the church: but this is said dictator-like.

And for the complying answer, that is there given, and fills four or five pages more; which was written, it seems, by Mr. de la Roque: I thought at first it had been a sham; it looks as if the author himself, or some other papist or antipædobaptist, had framed an answer under the name of a protestant, such as they would have. But Mr. de la Roque was, it seems, a learned man in other points, and has well refuted the main of his adversary's book; which is of communion in one kind: but having occasion to speak of this matter only by the by, and having not studied it, but depending on Grotius, and having not well minded what Grotius says neither, he has yielded even more than his opponent pretended to. The opponent had said that infant-baptism depends 'solely on 'the tradition of the church.' The answerer throws away even this grant; and says, 'The primitive church did not baptize infants,' p. 188, and proves it by nothing but an allegation, that is quite mistaken in matter of fact: he says, 'the learned Grotius proves it 'in his Annotations on the Gospel.' Let any one read the annotations, and he will see that Grotius, (how much soever he acts the

prevaricator at that place,) so far from proving, does not pretend that there ever was a time in which the church ‘did not baptize ‘infants:’ but only ‘libertatem et consuetudinis differentiam,’ ‘the ‘liberty and difference of the custom;’ viz. that some in the church did, and some did not. And how groundless his pretence even of that is, I have endeavoured to shew at the foresaid ch. ii. § 9.

One would think, that even the weakest among the antipædobaptists should apprehend, that this new favour and lovingkindness which the priests and Jesuits shew to their side, is all of the same stamp and design, as was that which the late king James, by counsel of the same men, shewed to the dissenters in general; viz. that by furthering the division they might weaken us all. And as all the honest men among the dissenters then did scorn and refuse those favours, when they saw whither they tended, so ought the antipædobaptists in this case. But if they will not be dissuaded from tampering with the deceitful gifts of the enemy; then their best way is, to do as some have done before them, viz. to borrow the arguments of the Jesuits without saying where they have them. For people will be never the more persuaded that infant-baptism cannot be proved from Scripture, because a papist says so.

The English antipædobaptists are as careful as men in their circumstances can well be, against this intrusion of papists in disguise; by requiring an account of any new preacher coming to them: but it is a thing that can hardly be ever totally prevented without a draught of articles of religion, to which every preacher should subscribe.

VII. Of the antipædobaptists in Poland I have not much to say; save that they were formerly there in great numbers. Lælius <sup>1450.</sup> Socinus about the year 1550, and after him his nephew (A.D. 1550.) Faustus, broached there a most desperate opinion against the divinity of our Saviour Christ<sup>h</sup>; *Who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.* Some heretics of old (but yet none within one thousand years of that time) had held that Jesus was a mere man: and that the word or Λόγος did only come upon him, or inhabit in him. But these men taught, that even the word himself, of whom St. John speaks, was a creature. Which was a heresy perfectly new, and surpassing in impiety almost all that ever were. So they renounced the doctrine of the Trinity. The form of words by which Christians are baptized, *In the name of the Father, the Son,*

and the *Holy Spirit*, stood in their way. Socinus therefore expressed a very slighting opinion of all water-baptism. He would have it be accounted needless in a nation that is settled in the profession of Christianity. He said<sup>i</sup>, the apostles practised it; but they had no command so to do: and so other Christians might use it as an indifferent thing. That they may baptize, if they will; or let it alone, if they will. And if they will give baptism, they may give it in infancy or in adult age: it is muchwhat one. His followers, many of them, took him at this last proposal. They would baptize, but not in infancy.

There were also some other antipædobaptists that were not Socinians. But they were so generally mixed, that the ordinary name given to all Socinians was Anabaptists. About the <sup>1550.</sup> (A.D. 1650.) year 1650, they were by public edicts expelled that kingdom: as the protestants in general have since been.

And the same may be said of Bohemia and Moravia, and some other countries thereabouts. There were for about one hundred years many antipædobaptists mixed with the protestants in those countries. But both one and the other have since been by popish persecutions either perverted, or forced to seek new seats.

In Hungary and Transylvania, but especially the latter, there are said to be still considerable numbers of them; some towns and villages consisting mostly of these men. But it is said withal<sup>k</sup>, that they are mostly Socinians. There were in Transylvania so long ago as the time of the later Socinus beforementioned, viz. Faustus Socinus, some of these that were deeper in that heresy, if possible, than he himself was. They held, as he tells us<sup>l</sup>, ‘the doctrines of ‘the TRINITY and of INFANT-BAPTISM to be the chief errors of ‘the other churches. So that if any one would renounce these ‘two, and would firmly hold, that all that have been baptized in ‘infancy must be baptized when they are grown up; they would ‘own such an one for a brother in point of doctrine,’ &c. though he differed in some other things.

This is a gracious condescension. But yet I question whether, as the case stands, it will induce many to accept of the proposal: because all people thereabouts know, that by complying but a very little further, they may be admitted for true Mussulmen, and allowed to wear white turbans in the city of Stambol, an honour

<sup>i</sup> Disput. de Baptismo. Epist. de Baptismo ad Virum nobilem. Epist. altera de Baptismo. [printed in 8<sup>o</sup>. at Rakow, in 1613: and again, in the collection of

Socinus’ works in folio.]

<sup>k</sup> Osiander, Appendix Histor.

<sup>l</sup> Epist. de Baptismo ad Virum nobilem.



which these gentlemen seem very ambitious of. But as for those that desire to keep the name of Christians, God preserve them from the folly of buying the brotherhood of these men at so dear a rate as the renouncing of their God.

## CHAP. IX.

### *Of the most ancient Rites of Baptism.*

I. THE rites and circumstances attending baptism have been largely handled by Josephus Vicecomes<sup>m</sup>. I shall only briefly mention some of the most ancient.

It was the custom of every church of Christians to require adult persons that were to be baptized, to spend some time in prayer and fasting before their entrance into that holy covenant: that they might come with greater seriousness and steadfastness of resolution to the sacrament thereof. And the church did use to fast and pray with them and for them.

This fasting, though it be nowhere mentioned in Scripture, yet <sup>40.</sup> is expressly put among the customs of the Christians by (A.D. 140.) Justin Martyr, (who must have been born in the Scripture-times,) in that apology which he makes to the heathen emperors concerning the tenets and practices of the Christians. The place I recited before<sup>n</sup>.

<sup>100.</sup> And so it is also by Tertullian<sup>o</sup>. ‘They,’ says he, (A.D. 200.) ‘that come to baptism, must use the devotions of frequent ‘prayers, fastings, kneelings, and watchings, and the confession of ‘all their past sins; that they may at least do as much as was done ‘in John’s baptism: *They were baptized, it is said, confessing their ‘sins.*’

I said before<sup>p</sup>, that it is probable that this was none of the least reasons for keeping the Lent fast; because the baptism of so many people was to be at Easter. The council of Laodicea do order<sup>q</sup>, ‘that none be admitted to baptism at Easter that does not give in ‘his name before a fortnight of Lent be out. And that they must ‘all be able to say the Creed by Thursday before Easter. And ‘that, if any be baptized in sickness, when they recover, they must ‘learn and recite it.’

II. Their general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping the person, whether it were an infant, or grown man or

<sup>m</sup> [See above, at p. 497, a notice of his work on this subject.]

<sup>n</sup> Part i. ch. 11. § 3.

<sup>o</sup> Lib. de Baptismo, cap. 20.

<sup>p</sup> Part i. chap. 17. § 5.

<sup>q</sup> Can. 45, 46, 47.

woman, into the water. This is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that, as one cannot but pity the weak endeavours of such pædobaptists as would maintain the negative of it; so also we ought to disown and shew a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English antipædobaptists merely for their use of dipping. It is one thing to maintain that that circumstance is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism, and another, to go about to represent it as ridiculous and foolish, or as shameful and indecent; when it was in all probability the way by which our blessed Saviour, and for certain was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians, did receive their baptism. I shall not stay to produce the particular proofs of this. Many of the quotations which I brought for other purposes, and shall bring, do evince it. It is a great want of prudence, as well as of honesty, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true, and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says.

Before the Christian religion was so far encouraged as to have churches built for its service, they baptized in any river, pond, &c.

100. So Tertullian says<sup>r</sup>; ‘It is all one whether one be washed (A.D. 200.) ‘in the sea or in a pond, in a fountain or in a river, in a ‘standing or in a running water: nor is there any difference ‘between those that John baptized in Jordan, and those that Peter ‘baptized in the river Tiber.’ But when they came to have churches; one part of the church, or place nigh the church, called *the baptistery*, was employed to this use, and had a cistern, font, or pond large enough for several at once to go into the water; divided into two parts by a partition, one for the men and the other for the women for the ordinary baptisms.

On the other side, the antipædobaptists will be as unfair in their turn, if they do not grant that in the case of sickness, weakness, haste, want of quantity of water, or such like extraordinary occasions, baptism by affusion of water on the face was by the ancients counted sufficient baptism. I shall, out of the many proofs for it, produce two or three of the most ancient.

151. Anno Dom. 251. Novatian was by one party of the clergy and (A.D. 251.) people of Rome chosen bishop of that church, in a schismatical way, and in opposition to Cornelius, who had been before chosen by the major part, and was already ordained. Cornelius does in a letter to Fabius bishop of Antioch vindicate his right: and shews<sup>s</sup> that Novatian came not canonically to his orders of priesthood; much

<sup>r</sup> De Baptismo, c. 4.

<sup>s</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. 43.

less was he capable of being chosen bishop : for ‘ that all the clergy, ‘ and a great many of the laity, were against his being ordained ‘ presbyter, because it was not lawful (they said) for any one that ‘ had been baptized in his bed in time of sickness, [τὸν ἐν κλίνῃ διὰ ‘ νόσον περιχυθέντα,] as he had been, to be admitted to any office of ‘ the clergy.’

This shews that at the time when Novatian turned Christian,  
 120. which could not by this account be much above one  
 (A.D. 220.) hundred years after the apostles, it was the custom for any one that in time of sickness desired baptism, to have it administered to him in his bed by affusion : as in another part of this letter is said of him ; ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ ἣ ἔκειτο περιχυθείς : ‘ baptized by ‘ affusion in the bed as he lay.’ It is true, the Christians had then a rule among themselves, that such an one, if he recovered, should never be preferred to any office in the church. Which rule they made, not that they thought that manner of baptism to be less effectual than the other, but for the reason expressed by the council  
 214. of Neocæsarea held about eighty years after this time ;  
 (A.D. 314.) the twelfth canon whereof is ; ‘ He that is baptized when ‘ he is sick, ought not to be made a priest (for his coming to the ‘ faith is not voluntary, but from necessity) unless his diligence and ‘ faith do afterward prove commendable, or the scarcity of men fit ‘ for the office do require it.’

155. Another instance about the same time is this ; one  
 (A.D. 255.) Magnus, a countryman, writes to St. Cyprian<sup>t</sup>, desiring to be satisfied in some points relating to the schism of the Novatians. One was : whether those that were baptized in that schism must be baptized again if they come over from the schism to the church ? This, St. Cyprian answers, must be ; because all baptism, given by such as are in a state of division from the church, is void. The other was : whether they that in the communion of the church are baptized in bed, as Novatian was, must likewise be baptized again, if they recover ? To this St. Cyprian answers as follows :

‘ You inquire also, dear son, what I think of such as obtain the ‘ grace in time of their sickness and infirmity ; whether they are to ‘ be accounted lawful Christians, because they are not washed all over ‘ with the water of salvation, but have only some of it poured on ‘ them. In which matter I would use so much modesty and humi- ‘ lity, as not to prescribe so positively, but that every one should ‘ have the freedom of his own thought, and do as he thinks best. I ‘ do, according to the best of my mean capacity, judge thus ; that

<sup>t</sup> Cypriani Epist. 69. edit. Oxon. [76. edit. Benedictin. Paris. 1726.]



‘ the divine favours are not maimed or weakened, so as that any thing less than the whole of them is conveyed, where the benefit of them is received with a full and complete faith both of the giver and receiver.

‘ For the contagion of sin is not in the sacrament of salvation washed off by the same measures that the dirt of the skin and of the body is washed off in an ordinary and secular bath ; so as that there should be any necessity of soap and other helps, and a large pool or fish-pond by which the body is washed or cleansed. It is in another way that the breast of a believer is washed ; after another fashion that the mind of a man is by faith cleansed. In the sacraments of salvation, when necessity compels, the shortest ways of transacting Divine matters do, by God’s gracious dispensation, confer the whole benefit.

‘ And no man need therefore think otherwise, because these sick people, when they receive the grace of our Lord, have nothing but an affusion or sprinkling ; whenas the Holy Scripture by the prophet Ezekiel says<sup>u</sup>, *Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean,*’ &c.

He quotes to the same purpose, Numb. xix. 13, and viii. 7, &c. And having applied them, says a little after ; ‘ if any one think that they obtain no benefit, as having only an affusion of the water of salvation, do not let him mistake so far, as that the parties, if they recover of their sickness, should be baptized again. And if they must not be baptized again, that have already been sanctified with the baptism of the church ; why should they have cause of scandal given them concerning their religion and the pardon of our Lord ? What ! shall we think that they have granted to them the grace of our Lord, but in a weaker or less measure of the divine and Holy Spirit ; so as to be accounted Christians, but yet not in equal state with others ? No : the Holy Spirit is not given by several measures, but is wholly poured on them that believe,’ &c.

And having, in order to set forth this equality, alluded to what is said, Exod. xvi. 18, of every man’s having an equal homer of manna, he adds ; ‘ by which it was signified that the mercy and heavenly grace of Christ which was to come in aftertimes would be divided equally to all ; and the gift of the spiritual grace would be poured on all God’s people without any difference on account of sex or years of age,’ [which words are another proof of his owning infant-baptism,] ‘ or of respect of persons.’

‘ We see,’ says he, ‘ this proved by the experience of the thing :

<sup>u</sup> Ezek. xxxvi. 25.

‘ that such as are baptized and do obtain the grace in their sickness, when need so requires, are freed from the unclean spirit with which they were before possessed; and do live commendably and approved in the church, and do every day proceed by the increase of their faith to an increase of the heavenly grace,’ &c.

A little after, he argues thus; ‘ Can any one think it reasonable that so much honour should be shewed to the heretics, that such as come from them should never be asked whether they had a washing all over, or only an affusion of water; and yet among us any should detract from the truth and integrity of faith?’ &c. So that it appears, that the several sects did, as well as the church-party, use clinical baptism in case of necessity.

<sup>158.</sup> The Acts also of St. Laurence, who suffered martyrdom (A.D. 258.) about the same time as Cyprian, do tell how one of the soldiers that were to be his executioners, being converted, brought a pitcher of water for Laurence to baptize him with. And though these Acts, as they are now, are interpolated and mixed with falsehoods<sup>x</sup>; yet this passage seems to be genuine, because it is cited by Walafridus Strabo<sup>y</sup>, who lived before those times in which most of the Roman forgeries were added to the histories of their saints.

<sup>130</sup> Eusebius<sup>z</sup> also mentions Basilides baptized in prison by (A.D. 230.) some brethren. The strict custody under which Christian prisoners were kept, their tyrannical jailors hardly allowing them necessaries for life, much less such conveniences as they desired for their religion, makes it very probable that this must have been done by affusion only of some small quantity of water. And the like may be said of the jailor baptized by St. Paul in haste, *the same hour of the night*, (in which he was converted,) *he and all his, straightway*<sup>a</sup>.

These are some of the most ancient instances of that sort of baptism that are now extant in records. But the further one proceeds in reading the following times, the more frequent they are: inso-  
<sup>395.</sup> much that Gennadius<sup>b</sup> of Marseilles in the fifth century (A.D. 495.) speaks of baptism as given in the French church indifferently, by either of the ways, of immersion or aspersion. For having said, ‘ we believe the way of salvation to be open only to baptized persons; we believe that no catechumen, though he die in good works, has eternal life;’ he adds; ‘ except the case of

<sup>x</sup> [See these extended to the length of fifty folio pages, in the Acta Sanctorum, at the 10th day of August.]

<sup>y</sup> De Rebus Ecclesiast. cap. 26. [See some account of this author above, at

p. 339 of this volume.]

<sup>z</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. cap. 5.

<sup>a</sup> Acts xvi. 33.

<sup>b</sup> De Eccles. Dogmatibus, cap. 74.

‘ martyrdom, in which all the sacraments of baptism are completed.’ Then, to shew how martyrdom has all in it that baptism has, he says; ‘ the person to be baptized owns his faith before the priest : and when the interrogatories are put to him, makes his answer. The same does a martyr before the heathen judge : he also owns his faith ; and when the question is put to him, makes answer. The one after his confession is either wetted with the water, or else plunged into it ; and the other is either wetted with his own blood, or else is plunged [or overwhelmed] in fire.’

1155.  
(A.D. 1255.) In the times of Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure, immersion was in Italy the most common way ; but the other was ordinary enough. Thomas speaks thus<sup>c</sup> ; ‘ baptism may be given not only by immersion, but also by affusion of water, or sprinkling with it. But it is the safer way to baptize by immersion, because that is the most common custom.’ And again : ‘ by immersion the burial of Christ is more lively represented ; and therefore this is the most common and commendable way.’ Bonaventure says<sup>d</sup>, that the way of affusion was probably used by the apostles, and was in his time used in the churches of France, and some others : but he says ; the way of dipping into the water is ‘ the more common, and the fitter, and the safer.’

One would have thought that the cold countries should have been the first that should have changed the custom from dipping to affusion, because in cold climates the bathing of the body in water may seem much more unnatural and dangerous to the health than in the hot ones ; (and it is to be noted by the way, that all those countries of whose rites of baptism, and immersion used in it, we have any account in the Scripture, or other ancient history, are in hot climates ; where frequent and common bathing both of infants and grown persons is natural, and even necessary to the health). But by history it appears, that the cold climates held the custom of dipping as long as any ; for England, which is one of the coldest, was one of the latest that admitted this alteration of the ordinary way. Vasquez<sup>e</sup> having said that it was the old custom both in the East and the West to baptize both grown persons and infants, that were in health, by immersion : and that it plainly appears by the  
490.  
(A.D. 590.) words of St. Gregory, that the custom continued so to be in his time, adds ; ‘ and it continues, as they say, to this day among the English, as Erasmus has noted in the margin of

<sup>c</sup> Part. iii. Quæst. 66. Art. 7.

<sup>d</sup> In librum iv. Sententiarum, Distinct. 3. Art. 2. Quæst. 2.

<sup>e</sup> In Tertiam Partem S. Thomæ, Disput. 145. cap. 2.



‘ the 76th Epistle of St. Cyprian.’ Erasmus is there observing how the baptism of infants is in different countries variously administered: and says; ‘ perfunduntur apud nos, merguntur apud Anglos.’ ‘ With us [the Dutch] they have the water poured on them: in England they are dipped.’ Therefore it is probable that Erasmus wrote his Colloquy called *ἰχθυοφάγία* in England. In which he says; ‘ we dip children newly come forth from their mothers’ womb, all over into cold water, which has stood a long time in a stone font: I will not say, till it stinks.’ This is a good authority for so late as the time of Henry VIIIth, at which time he <sup>1436.</sup> lived in England. And I produced before<sup>f</sup> a passage out (A. D. 1536.) of a convocation in that king’s reign, which also shews that the general custom in England then was to dip infants. And it continued so for two reigns more.

I will here endeavour to trace the times when it began to be left off in the several countries of the west: meaning still, in the case of infants that were in health, and in the public baptism; for in the case of sickly or weak infants, there was always, in all countries, an allowance of affusion or sprinkling, to be given in haste, and in the house, or any other place.

France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health, and in <sup>395.</sup> the public way of administering it. Gennadius of Mar- (A. D. 495.) seilles, whose words I gave before<sup>g</sup>, is the first author that speaks of it as indifferent.

It came more and more into request in that country, till in <sup>1160.</sup> Bonaventure’s time it was become, as appears by his (A. D. 1260.) words last quoted, a very ordinary practice: and though he say, some other churches did then so use it, yet he names none but France.

<sup>1175.</sup> The synod of Angiers, 1275, speaks of dipping or pouring, (A. D. 1275.) as indifferently used; and blames some ignorant priests, for that they dip or pour the water but once: and instructs them that the general custom of the church is to dip thrice, or pour on water three times.

<sup>1304.</sup> The synod of Langres mentions pouring only; ‘ Let the (A. D. 1404.) priest make three pourings or sprinklings of water on the infant’s head,’ &c.

And so from thence to the year 1600, (and still to this day for aught I know,) the synodical acts and canons of the churches in France do mention, sometimes dipping or pouring, and sometimes

pouring only : but the practice for a long time has been pouring  
<sup>1485.</sup> only. The synod of Aix, 1585, says, ‘pouring or dipping,  
 (A.D. 1585.) ‘according as the use of the church is;’ and orders, that  
 ‘the pouring of the water be not done with the hand, but with a  
 ‘[ladle or vessel] kept in the font for that purpose.’ This account  
 of the synods I have out of *Bochelli Decreta Eccles. Gallicanæ*, lib. ii.  
*de baptismo*<sup>h</sup>.

From France it spread (but not till a good while after) into Italy,  
 Germany, Spain, &c., and last of all into England.

For Italy: I have shewn already, that dipping was the more  
<sup>1160.</sup> ordinary custom at the year 1260. By what degrees it  
 (A.D. 1260.) altered is not worth the while to search. In two hundred  
 years’ time the other became the ordinary way.

In Germany, Walafridus Strabo, 850, Rupertus, 1120, and several  
 others, do so speak of baptism, as that it appears by their words, that  
 dipping of infants was the general custom; except of such as were  
<sup>1436.</sup> sick, &c. and must be baptized in haste. But the council  
 (A.D. 1536.) of Cologne under Herman, in the year 1536, speaks of it  
 more indifferently: ‘The child is thrice either dipped or wetted with  
 ‘the water,’ &c. And fifteen years after, the *Agenda*<sup>i</sup> of the church  
<sup>1451.</sup> of Mentz, published by Sebastian, do recommend and  
 (A.D. 1551.) prefer the latter: ‘Then let the priest take the child in  
 ‘his left arm; and holding him over the font, let him with his right  
 ‘hand three several times take water out of the font, and pour it on  
 ‘the child’s head, *ita quod aqua tingat caput et scapulas*, so as that  
 ‘the water may wet its head and shoulders.’ Then they give a note  
 to this purpose; that immersion, once or thrice, or pouring of water,  
 may be used, and have been used, in the church: and that this variety  
 does not alter the nature of baptism: and that a man shall do ill to  
 break the custom of his church for either of them. But they add,  
 that it is better, if the church will allow, to use pouring on of  
 water. For suppose, say they, the priest be old and feeble, or have  
 the palsy in his hands, or the weather be very cold, or the child  
 very infirm, or be too big to be dipped in the font; then it is much  
 fitter to use affusion of the water. Then they bring the instance of  
 the apostles baptizing three thousand at a time, the instance of St.  
 Laurence, that I spoke of before, and the story (which I suppose is  
 forged) of Chlodoveus, baptized in that fashion by Remigius: and

<sup>h</sup> [Folio, Paris, 1609.]

<sup>i</sup> [See ‘*Agenda Ecclesiæ Moguntinensis*, per D. Sebastianum, Archiepiscopum  
 ‘Moguntinum,’ &c. folio, Moguntiae, 1551.]

The same book had been published previously, namely in the year 1480. Sebastian made some slight additions to it.]

say; ‘That therefore there may not be one way for the sick, and  
 ‘another for the healthy; one for children, and another for bigger  
 ‘persons; it is better that the minister of this sacrament do keep  
 ‘the safest way, which is, to pour water thrice: unless the custom  
 ‘be to the contrary.’

In England there seem to have been some priests so early as the  
 7.6. year 816 that attempted to bring in the use of baptism  
 (A.D. 816.) by affusion in the public administration; for Spelman re-  
 cites a canon of a council in that year<sup>k</sup>, ‘Let the priests know, that  
 ‘when they administer holy baptism, they must not pour the water  
 ‘on the head of the infants; but they must always be dipped in  
 ‘the font. As the Son of God gave his own example to all  
 ‘believers, when he was thrice dipped in the waters of Jordan; so  
 ‘it is necessary by order to be kept and used.’

Lyndewode, who was dean of the arches in the time of Henry V.  
 1322. 1422, and wrote the best account of our English Constitu-  
 (A.D. 1422.) tions, having spoken of the manner of baptizing infants  
 by dipping, adds this note<sup>l</sup>; ‘But this is not to be accounted to be  
 ‘of the necessity [or essence] of baptism: but it may be given also  
 ‘by pouring or sprinkling. And this holds especially where the  
 ‘custom of the church allows it.’ It is to be noted, that France  
 had, as I shewed just now, before this time, admitted of the way of  
 pouring water; and Lyndewode had lived in France under Henry  
 the Fifth of England, who was king there.

1280. Some do prove from Wickliffe, that it was held indif-  
 (A.D. 1380.) ferent in England, in his time, whether dipping or pouring  
 were used: because he says at one place, ‘Nor is it material whether  
 ‘they be dipped once or thrice, or water be poured on their heads:  
 ‘but it must be done according to the custom of the place where  
 ‘one dwells<sup>m</sup>.’ But we ought to take the whole context as it lies  
 in his book. He had been speaking of the necessity of baptism to  
 salvation, from that text, John iii. 5, and then adds; ‘et ordinavit  
 ‘ecclesia, quod quælibet persona fidelis in necessitatis articulo poterit  
 ‘baptizari [i. baptizare]——Nec refert,’ &c. ‘And the church has  
 ‘ordained that in a case of necessity any person that is fidel [or that  
 ‘is himself baptized] may give baptism, &c.——Nor is it material  
 ‘whether they be dipped,’ &c. Such words do not suppose any  
 other way than dipping used ordinarily: but only in a juncture of  
 necessity, or fear of the infant’s death.

<sup>k</sup> Concil. Anglicana, tom. i. pag. 331.  
 Synod. apud Celecyth. sub Walfredo.

<sup>l</sup> Constit. lib. iii. cap. de Baptismo.

<sup>m</sup> Trialog. lib. iv. cap. 11. [De Baptismo,  
 pag. 118. edit. 1525. 4to.]



The offices or liturgies for public baptism in the church of England did all along, so far as I can learn, enjoin dipping, without any mention of pouring or sprinkling. The *Manuale ad usum Sarum*,  
 1430. printed 1530, the 21st of Henry VIIIth, orders thus for  
 (A.D. 1530.) the public baptisms; ‘then let the priest take the child, and, having asked the name, baptize him by dipping him in the ‘water thrice’, &c. And John Frith<sup>n</sup>, writing in the year 1533 a  
 1433. Treatise of Baptism, calls the outward part of it, the  
 (A.D. 1533.) ‘plunging down in the water, and lifting up again.’ Which he often mentions, without ever mentioning pouring or sprinkling.

1449. In the Common Prayer Book printed 1549, the second  
 (A.D. 1549.) of king Edward the VIth, the order stands thus: ‘shall ‘dip it in the water thrice, &c.—So it be discreetly and warily ‘done: saying, *N.* I baptize thee,’ &c. But this order adds; ‘and ‘if the child be weak it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying ‘the foresaid words.’ Afterward, the books do leave out the word *thrice*: and do say; ‘shall dip it in the water, so it be discreetly,’ &c. Which alteration, I suppose<sup>n</sup>, was made in the sixth of Edward the VIth, for then there was a new edition of the  
 1452. book with some light alterations. And from thence it  
 (A.D. 1552.)  
 1562. stood unaltered as to this matter to the fourteenth of Charles II.

From this time of king Edward, Mr. Walker<sup>p</sup> (who has taken the most pains in tracing this matter) derives the beginning of the alteration of the general custom. He says, that ‘dipping was at ‘this time the more usual, but sprinkling was sometimes used:  
 1450. “ ‘which within the time of half a century [meaning from  
 (A.D. 1550) ‘1550 to 1600] prevailed to be the more general (as it is ‘now almost the only) way of baptizing.”’

But it is not probable that in so short a reign as that of king Edward, who died in 1553, the custom could receive any  
 1453. great alteration. Customs, in which the whole body of  
 (A.D. 1553.) the people is concerned, alter but slowly, when they do alter.

<sup>n</sup> [See ‘the works of Tyndal, Frith, and ‘Barnes,’ cited above.]

<sup>o</sup> [In the edition of 1549 the words are as given by Wall: in that of 1552, the word ‘thrice’ is omitted, the rest remain as before. In that of queen Elizabeth, published in 1559, the same. In king James’, of 1607, the same. In king Charles’, 1639, the same.]

It may be remembered, that in all these, even the earliest, we find, in the office for *private* baptism, a rubric enjoining that [first ‘one of the persons pre-‘sent,’ and afterwards] ‘the lawful minister’ shall dip the child in water *or* pour *water upon him*, saying, &c.]

<sup>p</sup> Doctrine of Baptisms, chap. x. p. 147. [8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1678.]

And in queen Mary's time the custom of dipping seems to have  
 1458. continued. For Watson<sup>a</sup>, the popish bishop of Lincoln,  
 (A.D. 1558.) did in the year 1558, which was the last of queen Mary,  
 publish a volume of sermons about the sacraments: in the fourth  
 of which he says; 'though the old and ancient tradition of the  
 ' church hath been from the beginning to dip the child three times,  
 ' &c., yet that is not of such necessity, but that if he be but once  
 ' dipped in the water, it is sufficient. Yea, and in time of great  
 ' peril and necessity, if the water be but poured upon his head, it  
 ' will suffice.' A sign, that pouring was not in queen Mary's  
 time used but in case of necessity.

But there are apparent reasons why that custom should alter  
 during queen Elizabeth's reign.

The latitude given in the Liturgy, which could have but little  
 effect in the short time of king Edward's reign, might, during the  
 long reign of this queen, produce an alteration proportionably  
 greater. It being allowed to weak children (though strong enough  
 to be brought to church) to be baptized by affusion, many fond  
 ladies and gentlewomen first, and then by degrees the common  
 people, would obtain the favour of the priest to have their children  
 pass for weak children, too tender to endure dipping in the water.  
 ' Especially,' (as Mr. Walker observes,) 'if some instance really  
 ' were, or were but fancied and framed, of some child's taking cold  
 ' or being otherwise prejudiced by its being dipped<sup>1</sup>.'

And another thing that had a greater influence than this, was;  
 that many of our English divines and other people had, during  
 queen Mary's bloody reign, fled into Germany, Switzerland, &c., and  
 coming back in queen Elizabeth's time, they brought with them a  
 great love to the customs of those protestant churches wherein they  
 had sojourned: and especially the authority of Calvin, and the rules  
 which he had established at Geneva, had a mighty influence on a  
 great number of our people about that time. Now Calvin had not  
 only given his dictate in his Institutions<sup>s</sup>, that 'the difference is of  
 ' no moment, whether he that is baptized be dipped all over; and  
 ' if so, whether thrice or once; or whether he be only wetted with  
 ' the water poured on him:' but he had also drawn up for the use  
 of his church at Geneva (and afterwards published to the world) a

<sup>a</sup> ['See Holsome and Catholyke doc-  
 ' tryne concerninge the seven Sacra-  
 ' mentes of Chrystes Church—set forth  
 ' in maner of short sermons—by  
 ' Thomas [Watson] bishop of Lincolne.'

4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1558.—Sermon iv. folio 22,  
 23.]

<sup>r</sup> [Doctrine of Baptisms, p. 147.]

<sup>s</sup> Lib. iv. cap. 15. § 19.

<sup>1436.</sup> form of administering the sacraments<sup>s</sup>, where, when he (A.D. 1536.) comes to order the act of baptizing, he words it thus: <sup>1445.</sup> (A.D. 1545.) ‘then the minister of baptism pours water on the infant: saying, I baptize thee,’ &c. There had been, as I said, some synods in some dioceses of France that had spoken of affusion without mentioning immersion at all; that being the common practice: but for an office or liturgy of any church, this is, I believe, the first in the world that prescribes affusion absolutely. Then Musculus had determined<sup>t</sup>, ‘as for dipping of the infant; we judge that not so necessary, but that it is free for the church to baptize either by dipping ‘or sprinkling.’ So that (as Mr. Walker observes<sup>u</sup>) ‘no wonder if ‘that custom prevailed at home, which our reformed divines in the ‘time of the Marian persecution had found to be the judgment of ‘other divines, and seen to be the practice of other churches ‘abroad; and especially of Mr. Calvin and his church at Geneva.’

And when there was added to all this the resolution of such a man as Dr. Whitaker, Regius Professor at Cambridge<sup>x</sup>, ‘Though in ‘case of grown persons that are in health, I think dipping to be ‘better; yet in the case of infants, and of sickly people, I think ‘sprinkling sufficient:’—The inclination of the people, backed with these authorities, carried the practice against the rubric; which still required dipping, except in case of weakness. So that in the latter times of queen Elizabeth, and during the reigns of king James and of king Charles I, very few children were dipped in the font. I have heard of one or two persons now living, who must have been born in those reigns, that they were baptized by dipping in the font; and of one clergyman now living, that has baptized some infants so: but am not certain.

P. S. I have since heard of several. And I myself have had one opportunity of administering baptism so, by the parents’ consent. But the children were however all that time carried to the font. As much as to say; the minister is ready to dip the child, if the parents will venture the health of it.

<sup>1545.</sup> Mr. Blake, who wrote in 1645 a pamphlet intitled, (A.D. 1645) ‘Infants’ Baptism freed from Antichristianism,’ says, p. 1, (in answer to his adversary, who had said that infants, pretended to

<sup>s</sup> Tractat. Theolog. Catechismus, p. 57. ed. Bezae, 1576, [contained in the eighth volume of Calvin’s works, folio, Amsterdam edition.]

<sup>t</sup> Loci Communes de Baptismo, p. 431. [See ‘Wolfgangi Musculi Loci Communes ‘Theologiæ Sacre,’ folio, Basilee, 1599. De Baptismo, § 3. p. 339.—Musculus con-

firms his judgment on the point by quotations from Augustine and Cyprian.]

<sup>u</sup> Doctrine of Baptism, ch. x. § 107. p. 148.

<sup>x</sup> Prælectiones de Sac. de Baptismo, Q. 1. c. 2. [See ‘Gul. Whitakeri Prælectiones de Sacramentis in genere,’ &c. 4<sup>o</sup>. Francofurti, 1624, p. 216.]



be baptized by the ministers of the church, have not true baptism, since they are not dipped, but sprinkled,) ‘I have been an eyewitness of many infants dipped; and know it to have been the constant practice of many ministers in their places for many years together.’ And again, p. 4, speaking of the present practice of that time, says; ‘Those that dip not infants, do not yet use to sprinkle them: there is a middle way between these two: I have seen several dipped; I never saw nor heard of any sprinkled, or (as some of you use to speak) *rualized*.——Our way is not by aspersion, but perfusion; not sprinkling drop by drop, but pouring on at once all that the hand contains.’ And for sprinkling says; ‘I leave them to defend it, that use it.’

Of what age Mr. Blake was when he wrote this, I know not; but in a pamphlet which he wrote the year before, viz. 1644, called ‘The Birth Privilegez,’ and which he dedicates to his parishioners of Tamworth in Staffordshire, he so speaks as that one may guess him to have been about forty-two years old. He says in the said Dedication, ‘I have served you for Christ a double apprenticeship of years almost complete: which time hath seemed to some to have added more than a third to the years of the days of my pilgrimage.’ What he means by ‘seem to some,’ I cannot imagine. But if he at 1644 were about forty-two, and could remember as he says; the dipping of infants must have been pretty ordinary during the former half of king James’ reign, if not longer. And for sprinkling, properly called, it seems it was at 1645 just then beginning, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times after 1641; for Mr. Blake had never used it, nor seen it used.

<sup>1544.</sup> But then came the Directory<sup>a</sup>, which forbids even the (A. D. 1644.) carrying of the child to the font; and says, ‘Baptism is to be administered, not in private places, or privately,’ (these are the men that have since brought baptism in private houses to be so spreading a custom as it is,) ‘but in the place of public worship, and in the face of the congregation, &c.—And not in the places where fonts in the time of popery were unfitly and superstitiously placed.’ So (parallel to the rest of their reformations) they reformed the font into a bason. This learned assembly could not remember that

<sup>z</sup> [‘The Birth Privilege; or. Covenant-holiness of Believers and their issue in the time of the Gospel. Together with the right of Infants to Baptism. By Thomas Blake, Master of Arts.’ 4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1644, pp. 33.]

<sup>a</sup> [See ‘A Directory for the Public Worship of God, &c. together with an ordinance of Parliament for taking away the Book of Common Prayer.’ 4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1644, p. 39, 40, 45.]

fonts to baptize in had been always used by the primitive Christians, long before the beginning of popery, and ever since churches were built: but that sprinkling, for the common use of baptizing, was really introduced (in France first, and then in the other popish countries) in times of popery: and that accordingly all those countries, in which the usurped power of the pope is, or has formerly been owned, have left off dipping of children in the font: but that all other countries in the world (which had never regarded his authority) do still use it: and that basons, except in case of necessity, were never used by papists, or any other Christians whatsoever, till by themselves.

The use was: the minister continuing in his reading desk, the child was brought and held below him; and there was placed for that use a little bason of water, about the bigness of a syllabub-pot, into which the minister dipping his fingers, and then holding his hand over the face of a child, some drops would fall from his fingers on the child's face. For the Directory says, it is 'not only lawful, but most expedient' to use pouring or sprinkling.

Upon the review of the Common Prayer Book, at the restauration, the church of England did not think fit (however prevalent the custom of sprinkling was) to forego their maxim; that it is most fitting to dip children that are well able to bear it. But they leave it wholly to the judgment of the godfathers and those that bring the child, whether the child may well endure dipping, or not; as they are indeed the most proper judges of that. So the priest is now ordered, 'If the godfathers do certify him that the child may well endure it, to dip it in the water discreetly and warily. But if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it.' The difference is only this: by the rubric as it stood before, the priest was to dip, unless there were an averment or allegation of weakness. *Now* he is not to dip, unless there be an averment or certifying of strength sufficient to endure it.

Except such antipædobaptists as do not allow of affusion in any case, (and I think there are few such but in England,) all the rest of the world will agree that this order is the most unexceptionable of any that could be given; and does keep as close to the primitive way as the coldness of our region, and the tenderness to which infants are now used, will admit. But in the practice, the godfathers take so much advantage of the reference that is made to their judgment, that they never do certify the priest 'that the child may well endure it:' and the priests do now seldom ask that question. And indeed it is needless, because they do always bring the child so

dressed in clothes, as to make it plain that they do not intend it shall be dipped. When dipping in the font was in fashion, they brought the child wrapped up in such a sort of clothing as could presently and without trouble be taken off, and put on again. I think they called it a *chrysome*<sup>b</sup>, or some such name. And besides, the fonts that have been built since the times I spoke of, are, many of them, built so small and bason-like, that a child cannot well be dipped in them, if it were desired.

Since the times that dipping of infants has been generally left off, many learned men in several countries have endeavoured to retrieve the use of it: but more in England than any where else in proportion.

Sotus gives his opinion<sup>c</sup>, that 'baptism ought still to be given by dipping; so as that it is not lawful to give it otherwise, unless for some necessary, or creditable, and reasonable cause.' But Vasquez<sup>d</sup> takes him up for this with some anger; and he maintains that now-

<sup>b</sup> [The *chrisome* (or more properly *chrisome-cloth*, being that which is worn specially for the purpose of receiving the baptismal *chris*m or anointing) denotes strictly a piece of white linen or cloth, in which infants were robed, immediately after being baptized, and before they were anointed. The rubric in the first Service-book of Edward VIth, printed 1549, directs that at the aforesaid period of the baptismal-ceremony, 'the minister shall put upon hym [the child] hys whyte vesture commonly called the *chrisome*, and say, "Take this whyte vesture for a token of the innocency, which by God's grace in this holy sacramente of baptisme is geven unto thee; and for a sygne whereby thou arte admonished, so long as thou livest, to geve thyself to innocencie of living, that after thys transitory lyfe thou mayest be partaker of the life everlasting. Amen."']

A subsequent rubric enjoins, that the minister 'shall commaunde that the *Chrisomes* bee broughte to the church, and delivered to the priestes after the accustomed manner, at the purificacyon of the mother of everye chylde.'

N. B. This latter clause will explain the sentence quoted by Nares in his Glossary, out of an old play, called the *City Match*:

'The preacher  
'is sent for to a churching, and doth ask  
'if you be ready: *he shall lose*, he says,  
'his *chrysome* else.'

This ceremony being abolished at the revival of our Liturgy in 1551, the fore-

going rubrics do not appear in the edition of 1552, nor in any subsequent ones.

It is obvious that the *chrysome* is the 'chrismale,' 'vestis chrismalis,' or 'pannus chrismalis' of the Romish Liturgy; from which indeed, the name, the custom, and in consequence the rubrics, were derived. The following directions, given to the baptismal sponsors, in an old 'Manuale secundum usum Ecclesie Sarum,' are curious in themselves, and to the point: 'Godfaders and Godmoders of this chylde; we charge you that ye charge the fader and the moder to kepe it from fyer and water, and other perilles, to the age of vii yerres. And that ye lerne, or set to lerne, the *Paternoster*, *Ave Maria*, and *Credo*, after the lawe of all holy church, and in all godly haste to be conferred of my lorde of the diocese, or of his depute; and that the moder bringe agen the *crysom* at hyr puryfication: and wasche youre hande or ye departe the church.' [fol. Antwerpiae (circa 1530) fol. 296.]

A *chrysome-child*, and sometimes simply 'a *chrysome*,' was anciently used to denote a child which died within the first month. And Nares informs us, that in some parts of England, the metaphor is extended to a calf killed before it be a month old, which is familiarly termed a *chrysome calf*.]

<sup>c</sup> In 4. Dist. 3. q. unica, Art. 7. [See Dominici a Soto, Segobiensis Theologi, in quantum Sententiarum commentarii, folio. Duaci, 1613.]

<sup>d</sup> In tertiam partem Thomæ, Disput. 145. cap. 2.



adays, since it is grown the common custom, affusion is perfectly as well as dipping. This he says of affusion, or ‘pouring on of water:’

<sup>1495.</sup> but for sprinkling of water, he says, ‘That is not at all in (A.D. 1595-) ‘use, and so cannot be practised without sin, unless for ‘some particular cause.’ Estius also does much commend dipping: but now that the other is the common custom, would have nothing altered.

In England Mr. Mede shewed his inclination to retrieve the ancient custom plain enough, (indeed he carried the argument for it too far,) when he saide, that ‘there was no such thing as sprinkling, ‘or *ῥαντισμός*, used in baptism in the apostles’ times, nor many ages ‘after them.’ If he takes sprinkling strictly, (as it is distinguished from pouring on of water,) it may be true; but if he say so of pouring water, it is not true, unless he limit it to ordinary cases.

Bishop Taylor, in his Rule of Conscience, and also Mr. Dan. Rogers<sup>f</sup>, in his Treatise of Sacraments, have said so much on this head, that Danvers the antipædobaptist catches hold of their words, and brings them among his authorities<sup>g</sup>, that to baptize is nothing else but to dip. But he is forced to curtail and misrepresent their words; for they do both of them in their own words (which he has left out) own, that baptism by affusion is true baptism. But so much is true, that they do both of them plead hard that it ought not to be used but in case of necessity, and that the ministers should in no other case dispense with the act of immersion. And indeed, as the rubric then stood, it required immersion positively, unless the child were weak. Here by the way I cannot but take notice how much trouble such an adventurous author as this Danvers is able to give to such a careful and exact answerer as Mr. Walker. Danvers does in this place deal with above twenty other writers after the same rate as he does with the two I mentioned; viz. Scapula, Stephanus, Pasor, Vossius, Leigh, Casaubon, Beza, Chamier, Hammond, Cajetan, Musculus, Piscator, Calvin, Keckerman, Diodatus, Grotius, Davenant, Tilenus, Dr. Cave, Wal. Strabo, and archbishop Tillotson. He does in the space of twelve pages<sup>h</sup> quote all these, in such words as if they had made dipping to be of the essence of baptism. Mr. Walker shews that he has abused every one of them; by affixing to some of them words that they never said, by adding to others, by altering and mistranslating others, and by curtailing the

<sup>e</sup> Diatribe on Titus iii. 5. [Works, p. 63. folio.]

<sup>f</sup> [See a Treatise of the two Sacraments of the Gospel, Baptisme and the Supper of the Lord. By D. R. [Daniel Rogers].

4to. London, 1633. Again, third edition, 4to. 1636.]

<sup>g</sup> Treatise of Baptism, part ii. ch. iv.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. from page 192 to page 204.

words of the rest. But what a trouble is this, to go upon such a man's errand from book to book, search the chapters, (which he commonly names wrong,) recite the words first as he quotes them, and then as they really are in the book? This cost Mr. Walker three large chapters<sup>i</sup>. And what would it have been to answer the whole book, which is all of a piece? This is the book that is so much handed about among the antipædobaptists of England.

But to go on to mention some more learned men of England that have wished for the restoring of the custom of dipping such infants as are in health. Sir Norton Knatchbull says thus<sup>k</sup>; 'With leave be it spoken; I am still of opinion that it would be more for the honour of the church, and for the [peace and] security of religion, if the old custom could conveniently be restored.' Yet he there declares himself fully satisfied with the lawfulness of the other way, so far as that nobody ought to doubt of its being true and full baptism. For avoiding the danger of cold, he thinks it advisable to restore another ancient custom also, of baptizing only at certain times of the year, except such infants as are like to die. But infants were, as I shewed before<sup>l</sup>, by that ancient custom excepted from any obligation to stay till those times. And Easter is in our climate no very warm season. And there is nothing commoner than for infants to die suddenly.

Mr. Walker has taken the most pains (I may venture to say it) of any man in the world, to shew that baptism by pouring, or sprinkling, is true baptism, and is valid: and that baptism so given ought not to be reiterated: and that all ages of the church have been of that opinion: and that the antipædobaptists have no reason to separate on that account. And yet in the same book he does in several places declare, that he thinks the other way more advisable for the ordinary use. In one of the chapters<sup>m</sup> which I mentioned, where he is vindicating the words of Mr. Dan. Rogers from the force which Mr. Danvers had put on them; and where he confesses of Mr. Rogers thus much; 'Mr. Rogers was for retrieving the use of dipping, as witnessed to by antiquity, approved by Scripture, required by the church, (as then it was, with not so much appearance of liberty in the case granted to the minister as now is,) and symbolical with the things signified in baptism:'—he adds his own opinion in these words; 'Which I could wish as well as, and

<sup>i</sup> [See Walker's *Doctrine of Baptisms*, 8vo. 1678.] ch. xi. xii. xiii.

<sup>k</sup> Annot. on 1 Pet. iii. 20. [See '*Animadversiones in libros Novi Testamenti*,

&c. 8vo. 1659. The word *pacem* does not occur in the passage.]

<sup>l</sup> Part i. ch. xvii. § 3.

<sup>m</sup> Chap. xi. § 52, 53.

‘as heartily as he, in order to the making of peace in the church, if that would do it.’ And in the next paragraph; ‘If I may speak my thoughts, I believe the ministers of the nation would be heartily glad if the people would desire, or be but willing to have their infants dipped, after the ancient manner both in this and in other churches; and bring them to baptism in such a condition as that they might be totally dipped, without fear of being destroyed.’ And in the conclusion of that book<sup>n</sup> he thus bespeaks the antipædobaptists; ‘And as some learned persons, who have defended the lawfulness of sprinkling, have yet in some respects preferred dipping before it: so, though I blame your holding an indispensable necessity of it, &c. Yet in order to the peace of the church by your reunion with it, and the saving of your souls by rescuing you from under the guilt of schism, I could wish the practice of it retrieved into use again; so far as possibly might be consistent with decency of baptizing, and safety to the baptized.’ He speaks often to the same purpose in his Modest Plea.

Dr. Towerson, in his Explication of the Catechism<sup>o</sup>, having recited the arguments for immersion, says, ‘How to take off the force of these arguments altogether, is a thing I mean not to consider; partly because our church seems to persuade such an immersion, and partly because I cannot but think the forementioned arguments to be so far of force, as to evince the necessity thereof, where there is not some greater necessity to occasion an alteration of it.’

Dr. Whitby says<sup>p</sup>, ‘It were to be wished that this custom [of immersion] might be again of general use; and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in case of the *clinici*, or in present danger of death.’

These (and possibly many more) have openly declared their thoughts concerning the present custom. And abundance of others have so largely and industriously proved that a total immersion was, as Dr. Cave says<sup>q</sup>, ‘the almost constant and universal custom of the primitive times,’ that they have sufficiently intimated their inclinations to be for it now. So that no man in this nation, who is dissatisfied with the other way, or does wish, or is but willing, that his child should be baptized by dipping, need in the least to doubt, but that any minister in this church would, according to the present

<sup>n</sup> Chap. xvii. page 293.

<sup>o</sup> Of Baptism, p. 20, 21, 22. [See a work entitled, ‘Of the Sacrament of Baptism, in pursuance of an explication of the Catechism of the church of England,’

by Gabriel Towerson, D.D. 8vo. London, 1687, part iii. page 58.]

<sup>p</sup> Comment. on Romans vi. 4.

<sup>q</sup> Primitive Christianity, part i. chap. 10. [8vo. 1675.]



direction of the rubric, readily comply with his desire, and, as Mr. Walker says, be glad of it.

And as for the danger of the infants catching cold by dipping, sir John Floyer has in a late book<sup>r</sup> endeavoured to shew, by reasons taken from the nature of our bodies, from the rules of medicine, from modern experiences, and from ancient history, that washing or dipping infants in cold water is, generally speaking, not only safe, but very useful: and that though no such religious rite as baptism had been instituted, yet reason and experience would have directed people to use cold bathing both of themselves and their children: and that it has in all former ages so directed them. For (besides that the Jews by God's law used it on many occasions, and the Christians made it the far most usual way of their baptism) he shews that all civilized nations, the Ægyptians, Greeks, Romans, &c. made frequent use of it, and gave great commendations of it: and that nature itself has taught this custom to many barbarous nations; the old Germans, Highlanders, Irish, Japanese, Tartars, and even the Samoieds who live in the coldest climate that is inhabited.

This learned physician gives a catalogue of diseases for which it is good: some of them, for which it is the best remedy that is known. And he says, he cannot advise his countrymen to any better method for preservation of health than the cold regimen: to dip all their children in baptism; to wash them often afterward till three quarters of a year old: to inure them to cold air, drinking of water, few clothes: to use them, when boys, to bathing in rivers; when men to cool baths, &c.

He prognosticates that the old modes in physie and religion will in time prevail, when people have had more experience in cold baths: and that the approbation of physicians would bring in the old use of immersion in baptism. If it do so, one half of the dispute (which has caused a schism) between the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists will be over. There are more of the first, who are brought, by the arguments of the other, to doubt of the validity of their baptism, for that they were not dipped at the receiving it, than there are for that they received it in infancy. Neither was there ever an antipædobaptist in England, as I shewed in the last chapter, till this custom of sprinkling children, instead of dipping them, in the ordinary baptisms, had for some time prevailed.

What has been said of this custom of pouring or sprinkling water in the ordinary use of baptism, is to be understood only in

<sup>r</sup> Of Cold baths. [See ΨΥΧΡΟΛΟΓΕΙΑ, or the History of Cold Bathing, both

ancient and modern: by Sir John Floyer.' Third edition, 8vo. London, 1709.]

reference to these western parts of Europe; for it is used ordinarily nowhere else. The Greek church, in all the branches of it, does still use immersion; and they hardly count a child, except in case of sickness, well baptized without it. And so do all other Christians in the world, except the Latins. That which I hinted before, is a rule that does not fail in any particular that I know of, viz. all those nations of Christians that do now, or formerly did, submit to the authority of the bishop of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring or sprinkling. And though the English received not this custom till after the decay of popery; yet they have since received it from such neighbour nations as had begun it in the times of the pope's power. But all other Christians in the world, who never owned the pope's usurped power, do, and ever did, dip their infants in the ordinary use.

And if we take the division of the world from the three main parts of it; all the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one third part of Europe, are of the last sort: in which third part of Europe are comprehended the Christians of Græcia, Thracia, Servia, Bulgaria, Rascia, Walachia, Moldavia, Russia Nigra, &c., and even the Muscovites, who, if coldness of the country will excuse, might plead for a dispensation with the most reason of any. Dr. Crull gives this account of them<sup>r</sup>; 'the priest takes the child stark naked into his arms, and dips him three times into the water, &c.—The water—is never warmed over the fire, though the cold be never so excessive: but they put it sometimes in some warm place or other, to take off a little of the cold.' If they warmed it more, I do not see where were the hurt. The Latins, that stayed behind at the council of Florence, do determine<sup>s</sup> it to be 'indifferent, whether baptism be administered in warm or in cold water.' And an archbishop of Samost, who has wrote the history of that island, says, at p. 45, that they use hot [or warm] water.

We have no reason to think that the Muscovites do submit to this, as to a hardship put upon them by the Christian religion; for they commonly, when they come sweating out of a hot stove, do suddenly throw themselves into cold water, and think it medicinal so to do, as the said doctor relates. And the neighbour nations thereabouts, even those that are not Christians, do ordinarily put

<sup>r</sup> State of Muscovy, vol. i. chap. 11. p. 193, 194.

<sup>s</sup> Cap. de Unione Jacobinorum et Armenorum. [See the decree of pope Eugenius the fourth, addressed to the Armenians, at page 1056 of vol. 31 of the councils edited by Mansi.]

<sup>t</sup> [See 'A Description of the present State of Samos, Nicaria, Patmos, and Mount Athos. By Joseph Georgirenes, archbishop of Samos, now living in London, translated,' &c. 8°. London, 1678. The book contains a Greek dedication by the archbishop, to James Duke of York.]

their infant children into the coldest water they can get, for health's sake, and to harden them. For so the same author tells of the Crim Tartars<sup>u</sup>, that 'the mothers do use to bathe their infants, once a day 'at least, in cold water, wherein a little salt is dissolved, to make 'them hardy.' And the success answers; for these are one of the healthiest, hardiest, and most vigorous nations in the world.

But whereas the said doctor says<sup>x</sup>, that 'the Muscovites glory 'that they are the only true Christians now in the world; foras- 'much as they are baptized, whereas others have been only 'sprinkled; which is the reason they allege for rebaptizing all such, 'of what persuasion soever, that embrace their religion:—This is neither consistent with the account given by himself in the same chapter<sup>y</sup> of their rebaptizations; that 'even Muscovites, who having 'changed their religion in another country, are willing to return to 'their own communion, must first be rebaptized: nor with the account of the practice of other Greek Christians, who do all baptize ordinarily by immersion as well as the Muscovites: nor with the account given by other writers of the practice of the Muscovites themselves. For though Mr. Daillé<sup>z</sup> do say much the same of them as Dr. Crull does here, (he does not say quite the same: he says, 'the Muscovites say, that the Latins are not duly and rightly baptized.)' Yet other writers say, that the Muscovites themselves do in case of the weakness of the child baptize by affusion. Joannes Fabri<sup>1</sup>, in an epistle that he has written purposely of these people's religion, says, 'if the child be strong, he is thrice plunged all over. 'Otherwise he is wetted with the water. But this last is seldom 'used: 'conspersio enim minus sufficiens judicatur,' 'for they 'count sprinkling not so well [or not so sufficient].' And another author quoted by Mr. Walker out of Purchas' Pilgrims, part iii. page 229<sup>b</sup> says, that in such a case a pot of warm water is poured on the child's head. And another, 'the priest pours a whole gallon 'of water upon the child,' &c.

Since the writing of this, I find that Mr. Russen<sup>c</sup>, ch. 5, (quoting for it *Alvarez*, ch. 5,) says, 'the Abassens baptize in the church- 'poreh, without fonts, with a pot full of water only.' I know not what credit is to be given to this. I know that Brerewood<sup>d</sup> does

<sup>u</sup> Chap. vii. p. 112.

<sup>x</sup> Chap. xi. at the beginning, p. 183.

<sup>y</sup> [Page 194.]

<sup>z</sup> Lib. 2. de usu Patrum, p. 148, [or p. 329, of the edition 4<sup>o</sup>. Genevæ, 1656.]

<sup>1</sup> [See a work by Johannes Fabri, an archbishop of Vienna, entitled 'Moscovitæ Religio,' printed at Basle in 1526, at Spire in 1582, and to be found in the

collection of 'Rerum Muscoviticarum 'Auctores Varii,' folio, Francofurti, 1600. See p. 136 of this last edition.]

<sup>b</sup> [Folio, London, 1625.]

<sup>c</sup> [This passage of Mr. Russen is quoted in Stennet's answer to him, p. 129.]

<sup>d</sup> ['Enquiries concerning Languages 'and Religion,' &c. 4<sup>o</sup>. 1614.]



often note Alvarez as an unfaithful relater. And Brerewood himself, though he say nothing of the manner of their baptizing infants, (only that they do it on the fortieth day for a male, and the eightieth for a female child,) yet speaking of their yearly baptizing themselves on twelfth-day, (not using it as a sacrament, but as a customary memorial of Christ's baptism on that day,) says, that they do it in lakes or ponds, ch. 23, which makes that which Alvarez says very improbable.

III. What was just now mentioned of the Muscovites baptizing *stark naked*, and dipping *three times*, is perfectly agreeable to the ancient practice in both the usages. The ancient Christians, when they were baptized by immersion, were all baptized naked; whether they were men, women, or children. Vossius<sup>e</sup> has collected several proofs of this: which I shall omit, because it is a clear case. The English antipædobaptists need not have made so great an outcry against Mr. Baxter, for his saying that they baptized naked: for if they had, it had been no more than the primitive Christians did. They thought it better represented the putting off the old man, and also the nakedness of Christ on the cross: moreover, as baptism is a washing, they judged it should be the washing of the body, not of the clothes.

They took great care for preserving the modesty of any woman that was to be baptized. There was none but women came near or in sight till she was undressed, and her body in the water: then the priest came, and putting her head also under water, used the form of baptism. Then he departed, and the women took her out of the water, and clothed her again in white garments.

There is an account given by Sozomen<sup>f</sup> of an insult made by the <sup>303.</sup> soldiers in the great church at Constantinople, against (A. D. 403.) St. Chrysostom and his adherents: and how in Easter-eve they rushed in armed: and he adds, 'there was a great tumult at the font, the women shrieking in a fright, and the children crying: the priests and deacons were beaten, and forced to run away with their vestments on. What else must needs happen in such a confusion, they that have been baptized do apprehend; but I shall not express it, lest some that are not Christians do light upon my book.'

But St. Chrysostom himself, in a letter of complaint of this matter to Innocent then bishop of Rome, describes the foulness of the outrage more particularly: 'The women who had undressed themselves in order to be baptized, were forced by the fright of this

<sup>e</sup> De Baptismo, Disput. 1. cap. 6, 7, 8.

<sup>f</sup> Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. 21.

‘ violence to run away naked ; not being permitted in that amazement to provide for the modesty and credit of their sex. And many of them were also wounded: the font was stained with blood, and the holy waters of it dyed with a red colour.’

IV. The way of trine immersion, or plunging the head of the person three times into the water, was the general practice of all antiquity. Tertullian, in a dispute against Praxeas, who held but one person in the Trinity, uses this among other arguments; our Saviour commanded the apostles, *that they should baptize unto the Father, and unto the Son, and unto the Holy Spirit*; ‘ not unto one person, for we are not plunged once, but three times ; once at the naming of each name.’ And the fiftieth [alias 42] of those canons that are very ancient, though without reason called *apostolic*, orders any bishop or presbyter that does not use the trine immersion in baptism to be deposed.

The ancients do themselves own that there is no command in Scripture for this : yet they speak of it as brought into use by the apostles. And it is common with them to urge this custom and some others, as instances that some rites or orders are derived from the apostles’ practice, and yet not set down in Scripture. Tertullian<sup>h</sup>, arguing against some that pleaded, that ‘ in all pretence of tradition, one must produce some written authority,’ gives an answer, which I shall here recite at large, because he instances in this and several other customs then received.

100. ‘ Let us try then, whether no tradition ought to be allowed that is not written : and I shall freely grant that this need not to be allowed, if the contrary be not evinced by the examples of several other customs, which without the authority of any Scripture are approved, only on the account that they were first delivered, and have ever since been used.

‘ Now to begin with baptism. When we come to the water, we do there (and we do the same also, a little before, in the congregation) under the hand of the pastor make a profession that we do renounce the Devil, and his pomp, and his angels. Then we are three times plunged into the water : and we answer some few words more than those which our Saviour in the Gospel has enjoined. When we are taken up out of the water, we taste a mixture of milk and honey. And from that day we abstain a whole week from bathing ourselves, which otherwise we use every day.

‘ The sacrament of the Eucharist, which our Lord celebrated at

g Cap. 26.

h De Corona Militis, ch. 1, 2, 3.

‘meal-time, and ordered all to take; we receive in our assemblies before day: and never but from the hands of the pastor.

‘We give oblations every year for [or in commemoration of] the dead on the day of their martyrdom. We count it an unfitting thing to keep any fasts on the Lord’s day, or to kneel at our prayers on that day. The same liberty we take all the time from Easter to Pentecost.

‘We are troubled at it, if any of our bread or wine fall to the ground. At every setting out, or entry on business; whenever we come in or go out from any place; when we dress for a journey; when we go into a bath; when we go to meat; when the candles are brought in; when we lie down, or sit down; and whatever business we have; we make on our foreheads the sign of the cross.

‘If you search in the Scriptures for any command for these and such like usages, you shall find none. Tradition will be urged to you as the ground of them; custom as the confirmer of them; and our religion teaches to observe them.’

Of the oblations and prayers which they made for [or in commemoration of] the dead; as I said before in the first part, chap. xx. § 3. that they were nothing of the nature of the popish ones; so here it appears: for they used them for martyrs themselves. And though we see here, that the papists were not the first that used the sign of the cross; yet they are the first that ever taught that it is to be worshipped.

<sup>278.</sup>  
(A.D. 378.) In an epistle of St. Hierome in form of a dialogue<sup>i</sup>, one of the parties makes the same use of the same instance of trine immersion, as Tertullian does here: saying thus of the custom of confirmation after baptism, which he there proves by Scripture, but adds; ‘And if there were no authority of Scripture for it; the consent of the whole world in that matter would obtain the force of a precept. For many other things which are by tradition observed in the church, have got authority as if they were written laws: as, in the font of baptism, *ter caput mergitare*, to plunge the head *thrice* under  
<sup>260.</sup> ‘water,’ &c. St. Basil speaks just after the same manner  
(A.D. 360.) of the same thing<sup>k</sup>. And St. Chrysostom<sup>l</sup> says, ‘Our Lord has delivered to us one baptism by three immersions.’

<sup>280.</sup>  
(A.D. 380.) The Eunomians had the oddest way of baptizing that ever was heard of. For besides that they differed from all

<sup>i</sup> Dialogus adv. Luciferianos. [Sect. 8. Op. tom. ii. p. 180. edit. Vallarsii.]

Op. tom. iii. p. 54. edit. Benedict. 1721.]

<sup>l</sup> Homil. de Fide. [tom. vii. p. 290. edit. Savill. tom. ix. p. 854. ed. Montfaucon.]

<sup>k</sup> Lib. de Spiritu Sancto, c. 27. [Sect. 66.



other Christians in the words used at baptism, one sect of them baptizing only in the name of Christ, as I said<sup>m</sup>; another sect, instead of saying, ‘In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,’ expressed their own impious opinions in these words<sup>n</sup>; ‘In the name of the uncreated God, and in the name of his created Son, and in the name of the sanctifying Spirit, created by the Son, who is himself created.’ Besides this, their manner of baptizing was to plunge the person but once into the water: and that not all his body neither. For they said, all the parts of the body below the waist are abominable, and must not touch the water: so they used to uncover the person to the waist; and then holding his heels upward, and his head downward, they dipped him into the font as far as the waist. They continued this custom till a ridiculous accident happened<sup>o</sup>: a heavy and unwieldy man coming to be baptized, they that were to hold him with his head downward let him fall, and he broke his head against the bottom of the font. To prevent which mischance for the future, they invented another way. It was much the same as was one of the devices with which the Dutch are said to have tortured the English at Amboyna: only the muffler was larger. They tied one end of it about his waist, and turning the other open end upwards, they poured in water till it covered the head of the person. So it pleases God to suffer heretics to be infatuated, that must have newfangled ways.

The Catholics, though they judged the trine immersion to have been in use from the beginning, yet since it is not found to be enjoined by Christ nor his apostles, did not count it absolutely necessary to baptism. For about the year 590, some Spanish bishops sent to Gregory, bishop of Rome, for his advice. They told him their custom was to put the head of the baptized but once under the water: but that some Arians in that country kept up the custom of three immersions: and that they made a wicked advantage of it, by persuading the people that thereby was signified that there are three substances in the Trinity, into which they were separately baptized. Gregory makes them answer<sup>p</sup>; that though the custom of the church of Rome and other churches was three immersions, yet he in that case would advise them to keep to their present custom: that ‘in the same faith different usages of the church do no hurt: that whereas there is in the three persons but one substance, there could be no blame in dipping the infant either

<sup>m</sup> Chap. viii. § 6.

<sup>n</sup> Epiphanius, Hæres. 76.

<sup>o</sup> Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. lib. iv. cap. de Eunomio.

<sup>p</sup> Epist. ad Leandrum Episcopum Hispanensem, lib. i. c. 41. [See Gregorii Opera: also the Councils, tom. ix. p. 1059. edit. Mansi.]

‘once or thrice. For that by three immersions the three persons, or by one, the singularity of the substance was represented. That if they should now on a sudden take up the other custom, the heretics would boast that they were come over to their side,’ &c. So <sup>530.</sup> the Spaniards kept to the use of one immersion for some (A.D. 630.) time. For forty years after, it is confirmed in one of their councils<sup>q</sup>. But Walafridus Strabo says<sup>r</sup>, that after a while ‘the old way prevailed.’

The schoolmen among the papists, though they say that either way may do, yet speak of trine immersion, where immersion is used, as much the more fitting. And for the protestants, Vossius says<sup>s</sup>, ‘What son of the church will not willingly hold to that custom which the ancient church practised all over the world, except Spain? &c. Besides, at present the trine immersion is used in all countries: so that the custom cannot be changed without an affectation of novelty, and scandal given to the weak.’ He means all countries where immersion is used.

V. Of the circumstances that anciently attended baptism, some are mentioned by Tertullian in the place last recited. One is the signing of the forehead with the sign of the cross. This is spoken of <sup>280.</sup> by all the ancient writers as used by Christians upon all (A.D. 380.) occasions. They that nowadays are against the use of it at baptism do observe, that though the fathers do often mention this custom, yet none of them do speak particularly of its being used at baptism. I gave an instance, I think, plain enough to the contrary, in the first part, chap. xiv. § 5. And besides, when they say, as Tertullian here does, that it was used on every occasion that was never so little solemn; they I think sufficiently intimate its use at baptism, which is the most solemn act of a Christian’s whole life. Besides, that Tertullian speaking of baptism, says, *Caro signatur, ut anima muniatur.*

<sup>260.</sup> St. Basil mentions this custom of Christians at the same (A.D. 360.) place<sup>t</sup>, where he mentions that of trine immersion. And <sup>150.</sup> (A.D. 250.) St. Cyprian<sup>u</sup> having occasion to recite that text, Ezek. ix. 4, 5, 6, where the executioners of God’s wrath are commanded to *slay all, old and young, maids and little children, that had not the mark upon their foreheads*, applies it to the Christians, but says, it

<sup>q</sup> Concil. Tolet. 4. Can. 5. [or capit. 6. in Mansi’s Councils, tom. x. p. 618, 619.]

<sup>r</sup> De incrementis Eccles. c. 26. [Printed at Venice, 8vo. 1572; and in the collection published by Ferrarius under the title ‘De Catholicæ Ecclesiæ divinis Officiis ac ministeriis varii vetustorum fere omnium

‘Ecclesiæ patrum ac Scriptorum libri,’ folio, Romæ, 1591. p. 352.]

<sup>s</sup> De Baptismo, Disput. 2. Thes. 4.

<sup>t</sup> De Spiritu Sancto, c. 27. [Op. tom. iii. p. 54.]

<sup>u</sup> Ad Demetrianum, prope finem. [Cypriani Opera, p. 223. ed. Benedictin.]

signifies that none now can escape but those only that are *renati et signo Christi signati*, 'baptized and signed with Christ's mark.' And he frequently in other places speaks of it as a thing used by all Christians. And Rufinus says\*, 'it was the custom for every one at 'the end of the creed, *frontem signaculo contingere*, to make the sign 'on his forehead:' and we know that every one repeated the Creed at his baptism, either by himself or his sponsors, as Rufinus himself in his 'Explication of the Creed' mentions, and calls it the 'ancient custom.' [Sect. 3.]

It was a noble thing that they designed by this badge of the cross. It was to declare that they would not be ashamed of the cross of Christ: never be abashed at the flouts of the heathens, who objected to them that the person in whom they trusted as their God had been executed for a malefactor: never be scandalized if it came to be their fortune to suffer it themselves. On the contrary, they voluntarily owned it as their share and allotment in this world. This was according to our Saviour's rule, 'to deny themselves, to 'take up their cross, and follow him.' He that does this with a firm resolution is the man that has overcome this world.

VI. Another custom that Tertullian instances in, is, the giving to the new baptized person a mixture of 'milk and honey.' There is none of the ceremonial circumstances that accompanied baptism, of which so early mention is made, as there is of this, if Barnabas' epistle be so ancient as learned men do think. For as Tertullian one hundred years after the apostles here speaks of it as a thing generally and constantly used; so it is also plainly intimated in that epistle. Which because the interpreters of it have not minded, nor have taken any notice that the place does at all refer to baptism; I shall recite it something at large: and it will appear that this custom used at the Christian baptism gives some light to it, which otherwise seems to have none at all.

He had been shewing that many sayings of the Old Testament do in an allegorical way refer to the church of Christians that was to be. He instances for one in that description given by Moses of the promised land, where he calls it *a land flowing with milk and honey*. To explain how this belongs to the Christians, he says, chap. vi<sup>y</sup>, 'Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀνακαίνισας ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς ἄλλον τύπον ὡς παιδὶον ἔχειν τὴν ψυχὴν, ὡς αὖ καὶ ἀναπλασσομένους [1. ἀναπλασσόμενος] αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς, &c. 'Since God

\* Apol. i. statim ab initio. [Namely, the first book of Rufinus' *Invectives* against S. Jerome. See these in tom. ii. page 583, &c. (especially sect. 4.) of

Jerome's works edited by Vallarsius.]

† [See S. Barnabæ Epist. apud Patres Apostol. edit. Cotelerii, fol. 1698, p. 18.]



‘ having at the forgiveness of our sins [i.e. at baptism] renewed us, ‘ has caused us to have our hearts in another form as the heart of a ‘ child, just as if he had formed us anew, &c., therefore the prophet ‘ thus foretold it; *Enter into the land flowing with milk and honey, ‘ and rule in it.* ’Ιδοὺ οὖν ἡμεῖς ἀναπεπλάσμεθα, &c. *Behold then we ‘ are formed anew.* As also he speaks by another prophet, *Behold, ‘ says the Lord, I will take from them, that is, from those whom the ‘ Spirit of the Lord foresaw, their hearts of stone, and I will put into ‘ them hearts of flesh.*——Wherefore we are they whom he has ‘ brought into that good land. But what means the milk and ‘ honey? Because as a child is nourished first with milk, and then ‘ with honey; so we, being kept alive with the belief of his promises, and the word of his Gospel, shall live,’ &c. To the same purpose he speaks of baptism as a new formation, chap. xvi.

The coherence which he seems to mean, is thus. The Christian baptism does put us into a new state; by God’s forgiving us all that is past, and giving us new hearts, we are in the state of children new born. Milk and honey (which are therefore given after baptism) being food proper for children, and being the things by which Moses did characterise the promised land; that character of it does typify the true land of promise, to the enjoyment whereof the Christians are now by baptism called.

The custom of giving milk and honey to the new-baptized person, <sup>280.</sup> whether he were a grown man or an infant, continued (A.D. 380.) down to St. Hierome’s time; for he mentions it<sup>z</sup>. And how much longer, I know not: for I remember no later mention of it. It has however for a long time been forborne. It is natural to suppose, that this, being only an emblem to signify that the new-baptized person is as a new-born babe, was left off at such time when, the world being come into the church, there were hardly any more baptisms but of babes in a proper sense, who needed no such representation to signify their infancy.

It was in those first times of general use among the heretics, as <sup>100.</sup> well as catholics. For Tertullian objecting to Marcion<sup>a</sup>, (A.D. 200.) that his Christ, how much soever he undervalued the God that made the world, yet was forced to make use of his creatures even in his religious offices, says, ‘ he does not, for all that, reject ‘ the water of the Creator, with which he washes his disciples; nor ‘ his oil, with which he anoints them: *Nec mellis et lactis societatem,* <sup>60.</sup> ‘ *qua infantat:* nor the mixture of milk and honey, with (A.D. 160.) ‘ which he enters them as infants: nor his bread, &c.

<sup>z</sup> Adversus Luciferianos, [Op. tom. ii. edit. Vallars.]      <sup>a</sup> Contra Marcion. lib. i. cap. 14.

‘ being forced in his own sacraments to make use of the beggarly ‘ gifts of the Creator.’

VII. The white garment, in which the new-baptized persons were clothed, is not mentioned, that I know of, by any of the earliest writers. Cyril<sup>b</sup> mentions it; and in the after-times there <sup>250.</sup> (A. D. 350.) is much said about it. By it they signified that they were now ‘ washed from their sins in the blood of the Lamb, had put on ‘ Christ, were become children of the light and of the day; and resolved to keep themselves unspotted from the world.’ They wore this for a week: and then it was laid up as an evidence against them, if they ever revolted from that holy faith and profession. This was used in the case of infants, as well as of grown persons. I gave an instance before<sup>c</sup>.

VIII. There were in some churches two anointings used at baptism. One, of the naked body with oil just before the immersion. <sup>250.</sup> Of this St. Cyril speaks, *Catech. Mystag.* 2, and the author <sup>(A. D. 350.)</sup> of *Questiones a Gentilibus Propositæ*<sup>d</sup>, Q. 137; and St. Chrysostom, *Hom.* 6. in *Epist. ad Coloss.* <sup>290.</sup> (A. D. 390.)

The other, which was universally used, and is mentioned by the more ancient writers, was after the baptism, with a rich ointment or chrism. I observed before<sup>e</sup>, that the first mention we have of this <sup>67.</sup> chrism was the use of it by the Valentinian heretics; who, <sup>(A. D. 167.)</sup> as Irenæus tells us<sup>f</sup>, ‘ anointed the baptized person with ‘ balsam; and said, This ointment is a type of that sweetness which ‘ surpasses all things.’ But though this be something ancients than any mention of it as used among the Catholics; yet it is plain that it was also used by them generally about the same time; because authors a little after this do speak of it as an unquestioned <sup>100.</sup> custom. Tertullian recites it thus<sup>g</sup>; ‘ Then when we come <sup>(A. D. 200.)</sup> ‘ out of the water, we are anointed with a blessed [or ‘ consecrated] ointment, according to that ancient rite by which ‘ men used to be anointed for the priest’s office, with oil out of a ‘ horn; ever since the time that Aaron was anointed by Moses: so ‘ that Christ himself has his name from chrism [or unction]:’ and ‘ a little after; then we have the imposition of hands on us, which ‘ calls down and invites the Holy Spirit.’ And St. Cyprian thus<sup>h</sup>;

<sup>b</sup> Cateches. Mystagog. 4. [apud Cyrilli Hierosolym. Opera, p. 322. edit. Benedict. fol. Paris, 1720.]

<sup>c</sup> Part i. ch. xviii. § 1.

<sup>d</sup> [See *Questiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, a treatise formerly attributed to Justin Martyr, and printed with his works; viz. at p. 501. of the Benedictine

edition, fol. Paris, 1742.]

<sup>e</sup> Chap. v. § 1.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 2. [This reference is undoubtedly wrong: the passage quoted occurs in book i. chap. 21, [alias 18.] sect. 3. —p. 96 of the Benedictine edition.]

<sup>g</sup> De Baptismo, cap. 7.

<sup>h</sup> Epist. 70. ad Januarium.

150. 'The baptized person must be anointed also; that by  
 (A. D. 250.) 'having the chrism, that is, the anointing, he may be the  
 267.  
 (A. D. 367.) 'anointed of God.' And in the council of Laodicea the  
 forty-eighth canon is, 'Baptized persons must after their baptism  
 'receive the holy anointing,' &c. In a word; there is nothing more  
 frequently mentioned in antiquity than this anointing and laying on  
 of the hands of the bishop, in order to implore the graces of the  
 278.  
 (A. D. 378.) Holy Spirit on the baptized. And yet St. Hierome, when  
 he is in one of his moods, says<sup>i</sup>; 'We find this done in  
 'many places, more for the credit of the episcopal office, than for  
 'any necessity of the precept.'

The parts of the body, that were anointed, were not in all  
 churches the same. In the church of Jerusalem it was the forehead,  
 (which was ever in all churches one of the places,) and the ears, the  
 250.  
 (A. D. 350.) nostrils, and the breast: as appears by the third of St.  
 Cyril's Mystical Catechisms<sup>k</sup>.

The chrism was used presently after the baptism: and so was the  
 laying on of hands, if the person were adult, and the baptizer were  
 a bishop. But if the person were an infant, the laying on of hands  
 was deferred till he were of age, with his own mouth to ratify the  
 profession made at baptism. And though the person were adult;  
 yet if it was only a deacon or a presbyter that baptized him, the  
 laying on of hands was ordinarily reserved for the bishop to do: ac-  
 cording to that example of the church at Jerusalem, who having  
 heard that many people at Samaria had been converted and baptized  
 by Philip, who was but a deacon<sup>l</sup>, *sent unto them Peter and John.*  
*Then laid they their hands on them: and they received the Holy Ghost.*

205.  
 (A. D. 305.) The council of Eliberis do order<sup>m</sup>, that if a layman or a  
 deacon have in time of necessity given baptism: the  
 person, if he live, must be brought to the bishop for imposition of  
 hands. But they seem to suppose, that if the baptism was given by  
 a presbyter; he, in such case of necessity, might give the imposition  
 too, rather than the party die without it.

It was the custom of the church of Rome, that if the baptizer  
 were under the degree of a bishop, he should anoint the other parts  
 aforementioned, but not the forehead: and the anointing of that was

312.  
 (A. D. 412) reserved for the bishop to do, when he laid on hands, as I  
 341.  
 (A. D. 441.) quoted before<sup>n</sup> out of pope Innocent. But the first council  
 of Orange allows of but one anointing of the baptized, and

<sup>i</sup> Adversus Luciferianos. [sect. 8. Op.  
 tom. ii. p. 180. edit. Vallars.]

<sup>m</sup> Can. 38, and 77. [Concil. tom. ii. p. 12,  
 18. edit. Mansi.]

<sup>k</sup> [See the preceding page.]

<sup>n</sup> Part i. chap. xvii. § 6:

<sup>l</sup> Acts viii. 14, 15, &c.



that to be used presently after the baptism. ‘But if any one,’ say they<sup>o</sup>, ‘by reason of any accident was not anointed at his baptism; then the bishop shall be advised of it when he comes to confirm him. For we have but one benediction of chrism. Not pretending to set a rule to any, but that the anointing may be esteemed necessary.’

And in the church of Rome, though the ordinary rule were, that none but the bishop should give the chrism on the forehead, as I said; yet in case of scarcity of bishops, or of their negligence in performing their visitations to do this, it was allowed to presbyters<sup>490.</sup> to do it. For Gregory<sup>p</sup> the Great, in the ninth epistle of (A.D. 590.) his third book, says, that ‘presbyters may anoint the breast, but none but the bishop the forehead.’ But in Epistle 26 he revokes this order in the case of want of bishops, and in such a case allows the presbyters to anoint the forehead too. And long before his time, the same liberty had been given to presbyters, ‘in the absence of the bishop, not else,’ in the first council of Toledo<sup>q</sup>. And the author<sup>300.</sup> of the comments ascribed to St. Ambrose<sup>r</sup>, in Ephes. c. 4, (A.D. 400.) says, it was the custom at that time in Ægypt; ‘Apud Ægyptum presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit episcopus.’ ‘The presbyters do confirm, if the bishop be not present.’

<sup>120.</sup> Novatian, it seems, as he was not baptized in the ordinary way, but in his bed; (which was one objection against his being made a bishop;) so also he never had had this<sup>150.</sup> anointing and imposition of hands; upon which Corne- (A.D. 250.) lius founds this other objection against him<sup>s</sup>: ‘Neither was he, after he recovered, made partaker of those other things which a Christian ought by the rule of the church to have; i.e. to be confirmed [or sealed, *σφραγισθῆναι*] by the bishop: which he not having, how was he made partaker of the Holy Spirit?’

If any one had been baptized in a schismatical congregation, and afterward desired to be admitted among the catholics; he was by the rule of some churches to be baptized anew: but in the church of Rome (whose example finally prevailed) he was not baptized anew, (provided those from whom he came believed the Trinity, and baptized into it,) but he had a new imposition of hands and anointing. For they would never yield that the prayers of schismatics could procure the grace of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>o</sup> Can. 1. [Concil. tom. vi. p. 435. edit. Mansi.]

<sup>p</sup> [Vide Gregorii Opera: vel Concilia, edit. Mansi, tom. ix. p. 1161. 1173.]

<sup>q</sup> Can. 20. [Concil. ed. Mansi, tom. iii.

p. 1002.]

<sup>r</sup> [See these at p. 82. of the Appendix to vol. ii. of the Benedictine edition.]

<sup>s</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. 43. [p. m. pag. 313. edit. Reading.]

Of these two things, the chrism or anointing is not commanded in Scripture. Yet it is still practised by all the Christians of the east and west, except the protestants. But the laying on of hands is plainly mentioned in the Scripture, Acts viii. 17; Heb. vi. 2; and is yet continued by all Christians, except some very absurd people. It is enjoined in the church of England, with an excellent office drawn up on purpose for it. But I think there is never a divine of that church, that has not expressed his grief, that it is not more frequently offered, and more seriously and solemnly accepted and used. I hope so much of what St. Hierome says in the place I last quoted from him<sup>s</sup>, is true; ‘That it is not necessary to salvation: ‘for else,’ as he there says, ‘they are in a lamentable condition, who ‘in villages and remote places, being baptized by presbyters or ‘deacons, do die before the bishop’s visitation.’

These were the most ancient rites relating to baptism. Many that came up in after-times, and are now used in the church of Rome, are not worth the reciting: and it would be tedious to do it.

It is to be noted here, that some learned men, who are skilled in the customs of the Jews, do assure us, that those three ceremonies, of anointing the body at baptism, and of the trine immersion, and of the milk and honey, were all used by the Jews in their baptizing of a proselyte, whether infant or adult (as well as the requiring undertakers in the case of infants). And this is indeed the most probable account of the way from whence it was that the first Christians had these customs, of which there is no mention in the writings of the New Testament, viz. that they used them by imitation of the Jewish baptism. Which does still more confirm (what I discoursed of in the introduction<sup>t</sup>) that they reckoned their baptism to succeed (with some alterations) in the room of the Jewish baptism of proselytes of the nations.

IX. But the most material thing by far that was done at baptism was the *professions*; the sincerity whereof is more to be regarded than the external baptism itself: as St. Peter testifies, 1 Ep. iii. 21. They were constantly and universally required: in the case of grown persons, to be made with their own mouth in the most serious manner; and in the case of infants, by their sponsors in their name. That a man may justly wonder at the spirit of contradiction in those people that pretend baptism does better without them, and do practise accordingly: as if they had authority to

<sup>s</sup> Adversus Luciferianos. [See above, p. 267.]

<sup>t</sup> [See above, page 20—24.]

entitle persons to the kingdom of God, whether they do, when they come to age, keep the commandments or not.

These professions were of two sorts, relating to the two general duties of a Christian: 1. Renouncing of wickedness; and, 2. Faith, with obedience to God. Every one that would be entered into the holy covenant of Christianity, must promise to renounce the idolatry and false worship then used in the world, and all other wickedness.

10. The Scripture phrase is, *Repent and be baptized*. Pliny's (A.D. 110.) Letter to Trajan", concerning the Christians, is, that all the ill that he (by examining some that had been of their sect and were come off from it) could find in them, was, 'That they would 'not sacrifice to the gods; that they kept assemblies before day, in 'which they sang hymns of praise to Christ as their God; and 'bound themselves (not to any ill thing, that he could hear of, but) 'in a sacrament' (that is Pliny's word; it signified with them an *oath* or *solemn obligation*) 'not to be guilty of any theft, robbery, 'adultery, cheating, treachery,' &c. It was probably the obligation entered into at baptism, to which he refers; as having heard some general reports of their usage in that matter. Justin (A.D. 140) Martyr, in the passage which I recited in the First Part, ch. ii. § 3, speaking of such as they admitted into their society, describes them thus; 'They who are persuaded and do believe that 'those things which are taught by us are true, and do promise to 'live according to them,' &c.

The particular words in which this profession was made, were, by the account of the eldest authors that mention them, much the same as are used now; only shorter, and with some little variety in

100. the several churches. Tertullian, in the place lately (A.D. 200.) quoted, recites them thus: 'We do renounce the Devil, 'and his pomp, and his angels.' And he has the said words, without any alteration, in his book *de Spectaculis*, cap. 4; and in the book *de Idololatria*, though at ch. 6, he mentions only 'the Devil 'and his angels:' yet at ch. 18, he adds, 'since you have abjured 'the pomp of the Devil,' &c. So that it is probable those were the

110. very words of the form of renunciation in the church of (A.D. 210.) Carthage at that time. Origen brings in the Devil triumphing over a wicked Christian; 'Lo! this man was called a 'Christian, and was signed on the forehead with Christ's mark; but 'he had in his heart my precepts and designs. This is the man

<sup>u</sup> Lib. x. Epist. 97.

<sup>x</sup> De Corona Militis, cap. 3.

<sup>y</sup> In Psalm. 38. Homil. 2. [Op. tom. ii. p. 698.]



‘that at his baptism “renounced me and my works;” but afterward engaged himself in all my works, and obeyed my laws.’ But *Homil.* 12. in *Numeros*, he names them thus; ‘his pomp, his works, his services, and pleasures.’

<sup>240.</sup> In the church of Jerusalem the form, as we read in (A. D. 340.) St. Cyril<sup>e</sup>, was; ‘I renounce thee, O Satan, and all thy works, all thy pomp, and all thy service.’ And he explains the works of the Devil thus; ‘under the name of the Devil’s works is comprehended all sin.’ And he bids them mind, that ‘what they say at that solemn time is written down in God’s book; so that what they shall practise afterward to the contrary, will bring them  
<sup>300.</sup> ‘under the judgment of deserters.’ St. Chrysostom gives (A. D. 400.) us the form of the church of Antioch to the same purpose<sup>a</sup>; ‘I renounce thee, O Satan, and thy pomp, and thy service, and thy angels.’

<sup>150.</sup> St. Cyprian, in the passage that I recited out of him (A. D. 250.) in the First Part, chap. vi. § 11, styles it, ‘renouncing the Devil and the world;’ and he mentions it in the same words, *Lib. de Bono Patientiæ*, § 7.

When it was an infant that was baptized, these professions were made in his name and stead, by his parents, or others that stood as  
<sup>100.</sup> sponsors or godfathers for him: as appears by the words (A. D. 200) of Tertullian which I recited part i. ch. 4. § 5: where he objects that ‘the godfathers are by this means brought into danger: because they may either fail of their promises by death, or be deceived by a child’s proving wicked.’ Mistaking the design of the thing so far, as to think that the godfather stands to the peril of that. And among other fathers that lived a little after, the mention of the godfathers and of the answers made by them in the name of the infant is so frequent, and I have cited so many passages where it is occasionally mentioned, that there is no need of more. Only in some of them it may be observed, that there were, as I said, in several churches several variations of the words of this renuncia-  
<sup>300.</sup> tion. St. Austin<sup>b</sup>, lib. i. *de Peccatorum Meritis*, cap. 19, (A. D. 400.) says; ‘that infants do profess repentance by the words of those that bring them, when they do by them renounce the Devil and this world.’ And *Epist.* 23<sup>c</sup>, he says, it was asked among other things, ‘Does this child turn to God?’

<sup>z</sup> Catech. Myst. I. [p. 307, 308. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>a</sup> In *Epist. ad Coloss.* *Homil.* 6. [Op. tom. xi. p. 370. edit. Montfaucon.]

<sup>b</sup> [Op. tom. x. p. 11. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>c</sup> [Ibid. tom. ii. p. 263. *Epist.* 98. sect. 7. edit. Benedict.]

The requiring these obligations of the baptized person was called the *exorcising* him, or putting him to his oath. Which being become the common word, it was so called also in the case of infants. St. Austin pleads against the Pelagians<sup>d</sup>, that ‘it is in a real meaning, and not in a mockery, that the power of the Devil is ‘exorcised [or abjured] in infants, and they do renounce it by the ‘mouths of those that bring them, not being capable of doing it by ‘their own; that being delivered from the power of darkness, they ‘may be translated into the kingdom of their Lord.’

In the later times of the church of Rome, this exorcising has been accompanied with so many odd tricks of their invention, that the word now sounds ill in the ears of protestants: and they take the name *exorcist* to signify something like that of *conjuror* in the vulgar acceptation. But as both these words in their original signification do import no more than ‘the requiring of an oath or solemn promise:’ so the use of exorcising formerly was no more than I have described, and the protestants do practise; save that they observed some peculiar gestures, postures, and actions, in the time of doing it, which are not worth the particular naming.

X. They were bound also to profess the Christian FAITH. The words in which this was done in every particular church, were the same which that church used for a form of a Christian creed. The form of the creed was not in all churches the same in words, but in substance it was. It is great pity that there is not left any copy of any very ancient creed. We know both by the Scripture, and by their earliest writings, what was the substance of their faith: but we should be glad to have the very form of words which was used in the offices of each church, and according to which they put the interrogatories to the competents at baptism. We have some clauses of these left: but no entire form of a creed, till that which was agreed on at the first general meeting of Christians from all parts  
<sup>225.</sup> of the world, at Nice, anno Dom. 325. This is the eldest  
 (A.D. 325.) copy of any public creed that is extant.

In the oldest books of all that we have of the Fathers, it is as it is in the books of Scripture: the articles of our faith are found scattered up and down, but not collected into any one short draught or summary. There is nothing more probable than the opinion of those learned men, who judge that at first there was no other creed necessary for the baptized to repeat, than that which is collected from our Saviour’s own words, Matt. xxviii. 19, viz. that they should

<sup>d</sup> De Nuptiis, lib. i. cap. 20. [sect. 22. Op. tom. x. p. 291.]

say, *I believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Spirit.* But the heresies that arose did not suffer the church offices to continue in that simplicity and brevity.

I think there is nothing more edifying to a Christian, than to perceive that the substance of *the faith once for all delivered to the saints* has continued the same in the catholic church from the Scripture-times till now. Therefore I will take the pains to set down some of the most remarkable places out of such Christian writers, as are elder than any copies of creeds now extant, which do in short contain the sum of their belief; and agreeable to which their creed proposed to the catechumens must have been.

40.  
(A. D. 140.) Justin Martyr apologizes for the Christians, that they were not atheists, (as they were by some traduced to be;) for though they did not go to the temples, nor worship the gods; 'Yet,' says he<sup>e</sup>, 'the true God and Father of righteousness, &c. and 'his Son, that came forth from him, and has taught us and the 'angels, &c. these things; and the prophetic Spirit, we do worship 'and adore.' And having said (in the passage of the same apology, which I quoted in the First Part, ch. ii. § 3, about the Christians' manner of baptism,) that they were baptized in the name of these Three; he adds this further explication; 'There is named over the 'person [or, by the person] that has a mind to be regenerated, the 'name of the Father, God, and Lord of all<sup>f</sup>.' Then after a little digression, of the reason why the Christians do not affix any name to their God, as it was customary for the heathens; as Jupiter, Bacchus, &c., he goes on; 'And also the enlightened person [or 'baptized person] is washed in the name of Jesus Christ, that was 'crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Spirit, 'who by the prophets foretold the things concerning Jesus.'

67.  
(A. D. 167.) Irenæus having to do with the Valentinians, who taught that there was another God, above the Creator of the world, and when they were confuted by Scripture, appealed to some secret traditions; says<sup>g</sup>, 'It is easy for any one to know the 'tradition of the apostles declared in all the world: and we are

80.  
(A. D. 180.) 'able to reckon up those who were by the apostles or-  
(A. D. 180.) 'dained bishops in the churches, and their successors 'to this time; who never taught any such thing.' Then he recites the succession of some churches from the apostles, Peter, Paul, John, &c., and says; 'Suppose the apostles had left us no 'writings, ought we not to follow the order of that tradition, which

<sup>e</sup> Apol. 2. [Apolog. 1. sect. 6. secundum edit. Benedict. Op. Justin. p. 47.]

<sup>f</sup> [Ibid. sect. 61.]

<sup>g</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 3, 4.



‘ they delivered to those to whom they committed the churches?’ And to that purpose, he instances in many Christians in the barbarous nations that had no writings, and yet had the true faith by tradition: that is, says he,

‘ Believing in one God, who made heaven and earth, and all things in them by Jesus Christ, the Son of God; who out of highest love to his creatures vouchsafed to be born of a virgin, uniting in himself [or in his own person] man to God, and suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rose again, and was received up in great glory, and will come a Saviour of those that are saved, and a judge of those that are judged; and will send into eternal fire all that deprave his truth, and despise his Father, and his coming.’

Also on much the like occasion at another place<sup>h</sup>, having given a long account how strange things some heretics held, he says; ‘ Any one, that does but keep in his mind unaltered that rule of faith into which he was baptized,’ will easily perceive their falsehood. And then a little after gives the account of the catholic faith: thus;

‘ For the church that is extended over all the world to the ends of the earth, having received from the apostles, and their disciples the faith; which is;

‘ In one God the Father Almighty, that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things in them: and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was for our salvation incarnated: and in the Holy Spirit, who foretold by the prophets the dispensations of God, and the coming, the birth from a virgin, the suffering, the resurrection from the dead, and the bodily ascension into heaven, of Jesus Christ our beloved Lord; and his coming from heaven in the glory of the Father to restore all things, and to raise again all the bodies of mankind: that to Jesus Christ, our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King, every knee may, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, bow; both of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and every tongue may confess to him; and he may pass a righteous sentence on all; and may send the spiritual wickednesses, and the angels that sinned and apostatized, and all ungodly, and unrighteous, and unjust men, and blasphemers, into everlasting fire; and give life to the righteous and holy, and to such as have kept his commandments, and have continued in his love (some from the beginning, and some by repentance), and may bestow upon them immortality and eternal glory.’

<sup>h</sup> Lib. i. cap. 1 et 2.

This faith, he says, the church having received, keeps, ‘as if they had all one heart and one soul:’ and that neither the churches in Germany, nor those in Spain, or in France, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Africa, or under the middle of the world, had any other belief: and that a learned preacher would deliver no more than this; nor an ignorant layman any less.

Tertullian writing against Praxeas (who, not being able to believe three persons in one numerical essence, taught that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are but one person; and consequently, that the Father was incarnated, and was that Jesus Christ that died), opposes to him the faith of the church as it had always been held; thus<sup>i</sup>:

‘We believe that there is but one God: but yet with this dispensation or economy, that this one God has his Son, his *word* coming forth from him; by whom all things were made, and without him was not any thing made. That he was by the Father sent into the Virgin, and of her born, man and God, Son of man and Son of God, and named Jesus the Christ. That this is he that suffered, died, and was buried according to the Scriptures, and raised again by the Father, and taken up into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father, and will come to judge the living and the dead. Who sent from thence, according to his promise, from the Father the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, the sanctifier of the faith of those that believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

‘This rule has been derived down from the beginning of the Gospel, before even the eldest of the heretics; much more before Praxeas, who is but of yesterday.’

And then, reciting the objection of Praxeas, viz. that the unity of God can no otherwise be maintained but by holding Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be one person: he answers;

‘As if they were not in our sense all one, inasmuch as all are of one, that is, as to unity of the substance: and yet the mystery of the economy may be preserved, which dispenses the unity into a Trinity: ranking three; Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. “Tres, non statuas gradus; nec substantia, sed forma; nec potestate, sed specie.” Three, not in condition, but in order [or rank]; not in substance, but in form [or mode]; and not in power, but in species [which word I know not how to translate, being on so awful a subject]; but in one substance, and of one condition, and of one power; because they are but one God; out of whom those ranks, forms,

‘and species are reckoned under the names of Father, Son, and ‘Holy Spirit.’

The same author in another book<sup>k</sup>, writing against heretics in general, gives, in opposition to all of them, this summary of the Christian faith :

‘That we may declare what we hold: the rule of faith is; to ‘believe that there is but one God, and no other but the Maker of ‘the world, who created all things out of nothing by his *word* first ‘of all sent forth: that that *word*, being called his Son, was in ‘divers manners seen by the patriarchs under the name of God, ‘was in the prophets always heard, and at last being by the Spirit ‘and power of God brought into the Virgin Mary, and made flesh ‘in her womb, and born of her, was Jesus the Christ; and that ‘then he preached the new law and new promise of the kingdom of ‘heaven; did miracles; was crucified; rose again the third day; ‘was carried into heaven; sat down on the right hand of God; ‘sent in his stead the power of the Holy Spirit to lead them that ‘believe; that he will come in glory to receive the saints into the ‘enjoyment of eternal life and the heavenly promises; and to ‘adjudge the profane to eternal fire; having first raised both from ‘the dead, and restored to them their flesh.’

A shorter abstract, yet drawn by the same man upon another occasion<sup>l</sup>, is this :

‘The rule of faith is but one, altogether unalterable, and not to ‘be mended: that is, of believing in one God Almighty, Maker of ‘the world; and in his Son Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, ‘crucified under Pontius Pilate, who arose the third day from the ‘dead, was taken up into heaven, sits now at the right hand of the ‘Father, will come to judge the living and the dead, by raising the ‘flesh itself to life again.’

110. Origen being to write a book of the ‘Principles of (A. D. 210.) ‘Religion,’ makes a preface<sup>m</sup> to this purpose; that because of the many heretical opinions, it was necessary to set down that which is ‘the certain line and manifest rule; and by it to ‘inquire of the rest.’ This he calls ‘the ecclesiastical doctrine ‘delivered down from the apostles in the order of succession, and ‘continuing still in the church.’ And whereas some men that had better gifts than ordinary, might study and know some other things also; that this was ‘delivered by the apostles for the use of all, even ‘the dullest Christians.’ And he says, ‘It is this :

<sup>k</sup> De Præscriptionibus, cap. 13.

<sup>l</sup> De Velandis Virginibus, cap. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Περὶ ἀρχῶν. Præfat. [Op. tom. i. p. 47.]



‘ First, that there is one God, who has made and ordered all things, creating them out of nothing, the God of all holy men from the creation : of Adam, Moses,’ &c.

‘ That this God, who is both just and merciful, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, gave both the Law and the Prophets, and also the Gospel ; the same being the God both of the Old and New Testament.

‘ That Jesus Christ, who came, was begotten of the Father before all the creation : that he ministered to [or acted under] the Father in the creation of all things : for by him all things were made. That he in the last days humbled himself to be made man : he was made flesh when he was God, and continued to be man while he was God. He took a body like unto ours, differing only in this, that it was by the Holy Spirit born of a virgin. And that this Jesus the Christ was born and suffered truly, not in appearance only, but died truly the common death ; and did truly rise from the dead : and after his resurrection conversed with his disciples ; and was taken up.

‘ Then they have also delivered, that the Holy Spirit is joined with the Father and the Son, in honour and dignity.’

It may be here observed by the by, first, how Origen explains that phrase of St. Paul, Phil. ii. 7. *Being in the form of God, &c.* ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν, &c. *He in the last days, ‘ seipsum exinaniens, ‘ homo factus est,’ humbled [or emptied] himself to be made man.* He does not interpret it, that when he was a human soul, or angel in heaven, he humbled himself to take an earthly body. Secondly, how Rufinus according to Origen’s sense translates πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, Col. i. 15 ; he does not say, *The firstborn of every creature ;* much less does he say, ‘ The first of God’s creation.’ But, ‘ ante omnem creaturam natus ex Patre.’ ‘ Born [or begotten] of the Father before all the creation.’

These are some of the most ancient passages, wherein the authors undertake to give an account in few words of the faith, into which Christians were baptized. They do not say that these were the very forms of the creeds, by which the interrogatories were put ; but they must have been to this purpose. And whereas Tertullian says in the place I quoted before, that the custom was for the baptized person ‘ to answer some few words more than those which our Saviour in the Gospel has enjoined ;’ we may partly see here what they were. For whereas our Saviour had enjoined only those words, of believing ‘ in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit :’ and

whereas some heretics in those first ages, though keeping those words, yet had introduced monstrous opinions; some of the Father, that he was not the God of the Old Testament, but another; and some, of the Son, that he was not really a man, nor did really die, as some taught; or that he was not really God, as others: the church did examine the candidates, not only whether they believed 'in the Father,' but whether they believed him to be 'the maker of heaven and earth.' And not only whether they believed 'in the Son,' but whether they believed his divinity, incarnation, death, resurrection, &c. On these occasions it was, that the ordinary forms of the creed were augmented by some words added for explication sake. And these were not in every church the same words: but each church added such words as were necessary to obviate the heresies that arose in their country, and were in any particular contrary to the fundamentals of the faith.

And besides such explications concerning each person of the holy Trinity, they added also some other necessary articles of Christian faith to the creed, which the baptized person must make profession of. So we see in these passages (beside the doctrine of the Trinity) 'the resurrection of the dead,' and the 'future judgment,' and 'eternal life' plainly delivered. And more positively than any of the  
 100. rest, the article 'of the church' is by Tertullian men-  
 (A. D. 200.) tioned, as recited at baptism, in his book on that subject<sup>n</sup>; where having said that 'our faith is sealed [i. e. we are baptized] in 'the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit;' he adds, 'and when the testimony of our faith, and promise of our salvation, are assured by 'these three, there is necessarily added a mention of the church. 'For where the three, that is, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are, 'there is the church, which is the body of the three.' And also the same man, in another treatise<sup>o</sup>, mentioning occasionally the church, calls it, 'Sanctam ecclesiam, in quam repromisimus,' 'the holy church, the belief [or owning] whereof we have vowed.' So that it is plain, this article 'of the church' was in some of the most ancient creeds. The meaning of the profession of this article which they had was, 'I own the catholic church,' i. e. I am of no sect or schism, but do adhere to the communion and unity of the body: in explication of which sense were afterward added these words; 'the communion of saints:' that is, of Christians. This was their meaning of it; and they would baptize nobody without it. In what sense the sectaries, that do renounce this communion, and yet still

<sup>n</sup> Lib. de Baptismo, c. 6.

<sup>o</sup> Lib. v. contra Marcionem, cap. 4.

say those words with their mouth, do take them, I cannot imagine. As for baptism, I think they do, many of them, administer it without any creed at all.

150. About fifty years after the time of Tertullian, we have (A.D. 250.) in St. Cyprian the form in which the baptized were interrogated in his time concerning those other articles, that followed the confession of the Trinity; or at least a part of it.

In his sixty-ninth epistle<sup>p</sup>, disputing against such as would have baptism given by the Novatian schismatics to be good baptism, he says:

‘ If any one object, and say that Novatian holds the same rule as the catholic church does, and baptizes by the same creed that we do; that he owns the same God the Father, the same Son Christ, the same Holy Spirit; and therefore that he may baptize, since he seems not to differ from us in the interrogatories of baptism:—Let him that objects this, know; first, that the schismatics have not the same rule of the creed with us, nor the same interrogation; for when they say, “Dost thou believe the forgiveness of sins, and the life everlasting by the holy church?” they express a lie in their interrogation, since they have not [or own not] the church.’

And in his next epistle, to the same purpose: ‘When we say, “Dost thou believe the life everlasting and the forgiveness of sins by the holy church,” [or, by the means used in the holy church]?’ &c.

XI. From these traces we may perceive what was the substance of the most ancient creeds in the several churches: but we come now nigh those times, since which there are entire copies of the

225. public creeds remaining. The eldest of which is, as I said, (A.D. 325.) that which was at the council of Nice agreed on, as a form to be owned by all churches. It was this<sup>q</sup>:

‘ We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God: begotten of the Father: his only begotten; that is, of the substance [or essence] of the Father: God of God: light of light: very God of very God: begotten, not made: being co-essential [or of one substance] with the Father: by whom all things were made, both things in heaven, and things in earth. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down, and was incarnate, and made man. He suffered: and rose again the third

<sup>p</sup> Juxta edit. Oxon. [Ep. 76. in edit. Benedict.]

<sup>q</sup> Eusebii Epist. apud Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. c. 8.



‘ day. He went into heaven. He will come to judge the living and  
‘ the dead.

‘ And in the Holy Spirit.

‘ And those that say, that there ever was a time when he [Christ]  
‘ was not: or, that before he was begotten, he was not; or, that he  
‘ was made out of nothing; or, do say that the Son of God is of  
‘ any other substance or essence; or, that he was created; or, is  
‘ changeable, or alterable: such men the catholic and apostolic  
‘ church of God does renounce [or anathematize].’

<sup>282.</sup> When the council of Constantinople, which was in the  
(A.D. 382.) year 382, asserts this creed to be the ancientest, (as they  
do in a synodical epistle<sup>r</sup> written to the church of Rome,) they  
mean, it is the ancientest of any that had been established at any  
general meeting. But the several churches must have had forms  
for the use of baptism before.

But yet the creeds used before in the several churches must have  
been much to the same purpose: only in this there are some ex-

<sup>225.</sup> pressions added particularly against the heresy of Arius.  
(A.D. 325.) Eusebius’ creed, which he drew up and offered to the  
council of Nice, as the faith which, he says<sup>s</sup>, ‘ he had received from

<sup>185.</sup> ‘ the bishops before him, and at his catechising, and when  
(A.D. 285.) ‘ he was baptized; and which he had held and taught,  
‘ both while he was a presbyter, and since he had been a bishop,’  
differed but little. He says, ‘ the council accepted of his words,  
‘ making some additions.’ The form which he had offered was this:

‘ We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all  
‘ things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the  
‘ WORD of God, God of God, light of light, life of life, the only  
‘ begotten Son, born before all the creation, begotten of God the  
‘ Father before all worlds, by whom all things were made,’ &c.  
Here are recited in the body of the creed those words of the apostle,  
Col. i. 15. *Πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως*. And it is observable how they  
are paraphrased in the next words: *πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*  
*Πατρὸς γεγεννημένον*: *begotten of God the Father before all worlds* [or  
ages]: by which we may be sure they would not have translated  
*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* as our English does, *the firstborn of every*  
*creature*, (of which English expression the Arians and Socinians  
take advantage,) but ‘ born [or begotten] before all the creation.’

This, some learned men<sup>t</sup> do think was the very form of the creed  
that had been used time out of mind at Cæsarea. If so, then this is

<sup>r</sup> Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. c. 9.

<sup>s</sup> Epist. apud Socrat. lib. i. c. 8.

<sup>t</sup> Dr. Cave, Epist. Apologetica, [subjoined to his *Historia Litteraria*.]

the oldest copy extant of any public creed. But I think Eusebius' words do lead one to conceive that this was the substance, but the words his own: because he says, 'they accepted of *my* words with 'some additions.'

<sup>215.</sup> At the time when Arius first moved his controversy, (A.D. 315.) Alexander the bishop of the place opposed to his novelty, that the steady faith of Christians is, and always was, thus<sup>u</sup>:

'We believe in one unbegotten Father, who has no cause at all 'of his essence, &c. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only 'begotten Son of God: begotten, not out of nothing, but of the 'Father. We believe him, as well as the Father, to be unchange- 'able and unalterable, &c. And to differ nothing from the Father, 'but only that the Father is unbegotten, &c. That the Son does 'ever exist from the Father. He took a body, not in show only, 'but a real one, of the holy Virgin. In the end of the world he 'came among men to expiate their sins: he was crucified, and died, 'without any diminution of his divinity: he arose from the dead: 'he ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the majesty 'of God.

'Also one Holy Spirit, which inspired both the holy men of the 'Old Testament and the Divine teachers of the New.'

'Moreover one holy catholic and apostolic church: and the resur- 'rection of the dead.'

This, it seems, was the substance of what the Christians of Alexandria had ever held: but this could not be the very form; because it is (with the clauses that I have left out) too long for the use of baptism.

<sup>228.</sup> (A.D. 328.) Arius' own creed, given in to the emperor, was this<sup>x</sup>:

'We believe in one God, the Father Almighty. And in the Lord 'Jesus Christ, his Son: begotten of him before all worlds: God the 'WORD: by whom all things were made, both things in heaven, 'and things on earth. He came down, and was incarnated: he 'suffered and rose again, and ascended into heaven: and will come 'again to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Spirit. 'And in the resurrection of the flesh, and the life of the world to 'come, and the kingdom of heaven, and one catholic church of God 'from one end of the world to the other.'

And he subjoins; that since he had this faith, he entreated that he might by the emperor's means be admitted to the unity of the church, all questions and needless disputes being laid aside. But he conceals here his worst opinions, viz. that there was a time when

<sup>u</sup> Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 4.

<sup>x</sup> Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. c. 26.

God the Son was not : and that he was made out of nothing, &c., and was not very or true God.

<sup>237.</sup> Twelve years after the council of Nice, Constantine (A.D. 337.) dying, there succeeded in the East for forty years together, except very short intervals, emperors that were Arians. During which time the Arians, bearing the greatest sway in those parts, set up a great many new forms of creeds : some of them in words tolerably well agreeing with the catholic sense ; others, very disagreeable. But the general answer that the Christians of the West, (which were free from the Arian persecution,) and the catholic party in the East, gave, when any of these were proposed to them for their assent, was ; that the Nicene Creed was enough, and they would not entertain any new ones. I will give for a specimen one of the best and one of the worst of them.

<sup>241.</sup> I. The council of Arians, met at Antioch anno 341, (A.D. 341.) agreed upon this creed ;

‘ To believe in one God of all, the Creator of all things, visible and invisible. And in one only begotten Son of God, who before all worlds [or ages] subsisted and was together with the Father that begot him ; by whom all things, both visible and invisible, were made. He in the last days came down by the good-will of the Father, and took flesh of the holy Virgin : and having fulfilled all the Father’s counsel, suffered : and was raised again : and went back to heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father : and will come to judge the living and the dead : and continues to be King and God for ever. We believe also in the Holy Spirit. And if we need say any more, we believe the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting.’

<sup>244.</sup> And three years after, when the heresy of Photinus had (A.D. 344.) in the mean time burst out, meeting there again, they (to give as good satisfaction as they could to the western bishops) declared their sense of that heresy, and of the exorbitance of some Arians. After the body of their creed, much like the former, they add such clauses as these ; ‘ All that say, that the Son of God was made out of nothing, or of any other substance, and not of that of God ; or, that there ever was a time or age in which he was not : such men the holy catholic church renounces.’ They prove it to be both impious and absurd, ‘ to imagine any time before he was begotten ; since all time and all ages were made by him.’ They declare that ‘ neither when they profess three persons, *τρία Πρόσωπα*, they do make three Gods : nor when they say, there is one God



‘ the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the only unbegotten, do they  
 ‘ therefore deny Christ to be Θεὸν προαιώνιον, the eternal God [or  
 ‘ God before all ages].’ They do also own there, that he is ‘ God  
 ‘ by nature, perfect and true God.’ They profess ‘ their abhorrence  
 ‘ of Photinus, who makes the word to be ἀνύπαρκτον, without a per-  
 ‘ sonal subsistence.’ And say, ‘ As for ourselves, we know him to  
 ‘ be not merely as a word spoken, or as reason in God: but God the  
 ‘ WORD, and subsisting by himself, and the Son of God and Christ.  
 ‘ And that he was with his Father before the world, not by way of  
 ‘ prescience, &c., but the subsisting WORD of the Father, and GOD  
 ‘ of GOD—like to the Father in all things, &c. Moreover,’ say  
 they, ‘ we, understanding in a cautious sense that which is said of  
 ‘ him, *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way*<sup>a</sup>, [this text  
 ‘ the Greek translators had rendered, Κύριος ἔκτισέ με, *The Lord built*  
 ‘ *or made me,*] do by no means understand, that he was begotten in  
 ‘ a way like to the creatures made by him: for it were impious, and  
 ‘ against the faith of the church, to liken the Creator to the things  
 ‘ by him made, &c.——Thus we believe in the perfect and most  
 ‘ holy Trinity, calling the Father, God; and the Son, God; we do  
 ‘ not mean these to be two, but one God,’ &c. These men were not  
 very far from the catholic faith.

2. But about sixteen years afterward, this sect carried matters to more extravagant outrages. For the emperor Constantius, a bigoted Arian, being then at Antioch, a party met there, and determined that ‘ the Son is not at all like the Father, neither in essence nor in  
 ‘ will: that he was made out of nothing: as Arius had at first  
 ‘ said.’

Sozomen relating this<sup>b</sup>, says, that there were among these (who were but few in all) several of the party of Aetius, who, he says, ‘ was the first that after Arius ventured to use openly such ex-  
 ‘ pressions, and was therefore called *the atheist*.’ And about this time Eunomius, the partner of Aetius, published his creed to this purpose.

‘ There is one God, unbegotten and without beginning, &c., the  
 ‘ Maker and Creator of all things, and first of his only begotten  
 ‘ Son, &c. For he begot, created, and made his Son before all  
 ‘ things, and before all the creation, only by his power and ope-  
 ‘ ration: not communicating any thing of his own essence to him,  
 ‘ &c., nor making him another like himself, &c., but he begot him  
 ‘ of such a nature as he thought fit, &c. And by him he made,  
 ‘ first and the greatest of all, the Holy Spirit, &c. And after him,

<sup>a</sup> Prov. viii. 22.

<sup>b</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. 29.

‘ all the things in heaven and earth, &c. There is also one Holy Spirit, the first and greatest of the works of the only-begotten, made by the command of the Father, but by the power and operation of the Son.’

This man had reason to appoint among his followers a new form of baptism: for the old one did not fit to such opinions. So he laid it aside, and used that impious form of baptizing which I mentioned before at § 4. ‘ In the name of the unbegotten Father,’ &c.

The moderate and general sort of Arians did all the while own all that the Nicene Creed had said of our Saviour to be true, save that they thought not fit to determine that he is ‘ of one substance with the Father:’ as neither, on the contrary, did they think fit to say, as Arius had done, that he was ‘ created,’ or was ‘ of any other’ substance. They rejected both those clauses, and said that the substance or essence of God is unsearchable, and nothing ought to be

225. determined about it. Yet Eusebius<sup>b</sup> and Athanasius<sup>c</sup> (A. D. 325.) shewed them that that very word had been often used by the Christians both of the Greek and Latin church, above a hundred years before. Many of the books out of which they could then prove this, are now lost: yet for the Latins, Tertullian does use that

100. very expression in the passage of his that I quoted last. (A. D. 200.) And Pamphilus the martyr, in his Apology for Origen, (or be it Eusebius himself that was the author of that piece,) makes it plain that it was a common expression in the books of Origen that

110. were then extant. Yet if any in those times did scruple (A. D. 210.) the use of the word *ὑποούσιος*, as being not a Scripture word; but did by other words shew their belief in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, one God, to be catholic; Athanasius owns such men for brethren: and says, it was the case of Basil of Ancyra. *De Synodis Arimin. et Seleuc. non longe a fine*<sup>d</sup>.

However, we see that this sect of the Arians, even the dregs of it among the Eunomians, had not nigh so derogatory thoughts of the nature of our blessed Saviour, as our Socinians have; who take him to be a mere man, and to have had no being before his human birth. Photinus indeed did in those confused times broach that opinion which one sort of the Socinians do now fall into; that the

241. WORD, the *Λόγος*, of which St. John speaks, is eternal: (A. D. 341.) but that this WORD is not a person, nor did take man’s nature in Jesus Christ, was not *made flesh*, (as St. John says he

<sup>b</sup> Euseb. Epist. apud Socrat. lib. i. c. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. ad Afros, apud Theodoret. lib. i. c. 8.

<sup>d</sup> [See section 41 of that treatise, in the Benedictine edition of Athanasius, tom. i. p. 755.]

was,) but only inspired, directed, or dwelled in, the man Jesus. But he did no sooner say this, but that all sorts of Christians, Catholics, Arians, and Eunomians, joined in an abhorrence of him, as bishop Pearson shews at large, by reciting the condemnations of him particularly. And he concludes; ‘so suddenly was this opinion rejected by all Christians, applauded by none but Julian the<sup>261.</sup> heretic, [*lege* apostate,] who railed at St. John for making (A.D. 361.) ‘Christ God, and commended Photinus for denying it: as ‘appears by an epistle written by Julian to him, as it is, though in ‘a mean translation, delivered by Facundus ad Justinian. lib. iv. ‘“*Tu quidem O Photine,*” &c. You Photinus, say something like, ‘and come near to good sense. You do well not to bring him, ‘whom you think to be God, into a woman’s womb.’

And from that time till very lately, whoever embraced that opinion has thought fit at the same time to renounce the Scriptures, and the name of a Christian.

What creed the Arians used all this while, for their candidates to make their professions by at baptism, I know not; for their creeds that are upon record they altered almost every day. The Catholics in the East made use of the Nicene, as appears by *Epiphanius in Ancoratos*, where he gives directions that ‘every one of the catechu- ‘mens that would come to the holy laver must not only profess in ‘general to believe, but must be taught to say expressly, as their ‘and our mother does, viz. “We believe in one God,”’ &c., as it is in the Nicene Creed. Only in Epiphanius’ copy some clauses

<sup>281.</sup> are put in by a later hand (or by himself afterward) out (A.D. 381.) of the Constantinopolitan Creed, which was set forth four years after the first writing of that book. He dates his book the

<sup>277.</sup> tenth year of Valens, and he says, ‘This is the faith (A.D. 377.) ‘delivered by all the holy bishops together, above three ‘hundred and ten in number.’ Which must be the Nicene bishops.

So that it is certain he in the first edition of his book set down the Nicene: and it was interpolated afterwards with those few additions which the council of Constantinople made to it. And I indeed was of opinion that the same thing had happened to the Jerusalem

<sup>259.</sup> Creed, explained in way of catechism by St. Cyril. He (A.D. 359.) wrote those catechisms first in Constantius’ time; and yet there are in them, as they are now, the very clauses of the Constan-

<sup>281.</sup> tinopolitan Creed. This, I reckoned, could never have (A.D. 381.) happened so exact, but that he in his old age, (for he

<sup>e</sup> On the Creed, page 120. [in the folio editions, 1676 and 1723. Article II. ‘his ‘only Son.’]

<sup>f</sup> [Sect. 119. See Epiphani Opera, Petavii. fol. Paris. 1622. tom. ii. p. 122.]



lived to that time,) or somebody after him, had added those clauses which the council of Constantinople had put in. But I find that Mr. Grabe<sup>g</sup> is of another opinion, and thinks that the Jerusalem Creed, and several other ancient eastern creeds, had those clauses before the time of the Constantinopolitan council. To whose great learning I willingly subscribe.

There is from this time forward abundant evidence that the eastern churches generally made use of the Nicene Creed to be repeated at baptisms. The council of Ephesus<sup>h</sup> orders ‘that none do  
<sup>331.</sup> ‘write or propose any other faith [or creed] but that  
 (A.D. 431.) ‘which was agreed on by the holy Fathers assembled at  
 ‘Nice, &c.—And if any one do offer or propose any other to such as  
 ‘desire to be converted to the knowledge of the truth, [i. e. to such  
 ‘as come to be baptized,] either from the heathens, or from the  
 ‘Jews, or from any heresy; if they be bishops or clergymen, they  
 ‘shall be deposed; if laymen, excommunicated.’ The council of Chalcedon confirms the same<sup>i</sup>. And so does the edict of Justinian.

And several other synods do mention it as the faith ‘into  
<sup>351.</sup> (A.D. 451.) ‘which they were baptized, and into which they do  
<sup>430.</sup> (A.D. 530.) ‘baptize.’ Basiliscus, the usurper of the Greek empire, having in his edict mentioned this creed, adds, ‘into which both we  
<sup>376.</sup> ‘and all our ancestors that were Christians have been  
 (A.D. 476.) ‘baptized<sup>k</sup>.’ And the emperor Zeno enacts<sup>l</sup> that all baptisms should be by that.

This shews that what I quoted before<sup>m</sup> out of Gregory Nazianzen (that he would not baptize any Arian) was not singular in him: since the church in all those parts used at baptism that creed which has the expressions purposely levelled against that heresy.

XII. Valens, the great persecutor of the Nicene faith, died in the fourteenth year of his reign. And then the church had liberty once again to come together from all parts both of the East and  
<sup>281.</sup> West: which they did at Constantinople, anno 381. They  
 (A.D. 381.) made no doubt or delay of establishing the Nicene Creed, in opposition to all the novelties that had disturbed the world since it. Only inasmuch as some new heresies had sprung up since, especially about our belief in the Holy Spirit, they put in a few clauses against them. Eunomius, Macedonius, and some others, had followed Arius’ pattern of innovating, so far, that as he had

<sup>g</sup> Annot. in Opera Doct. Bull. [See ‘G. Bulli Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ,’ &c. cap. vi. sect. 6, 7, &c. p. 49. and Grabe’s Annotations, *ibid.* p. 65. edit. fol. Lond. 1703.]

<sup>h</sup> Act. 6.

<sup>i</sup> Evagrius, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. c. 4.

<sup>k</sup> Evagrius, lib. iii. c. 4.

<sup>l</sup> *Ibid.* cap. 14.

<sup>m</sup> Pt. i. ch. 11. § 8.

made the *Son of God* a creature, so they would do the same by the *Spirit of God*. Arius had had a much better handle to take hold of: for the Son did indeed take on him a created nature: and because in that nature he was born, died, &c., there were a great many plausible things to say among vulgar people. But to make the Spirit of God, which St. Paul shews to be inward to God, as the spirit of a man is to a man, saying, 1 Cor. ii. 11. *What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God*. To make him a creature too, was, we should think, a bold attempt, not only on the honour of God, but also on the reason and sense of men. But so it always happens. Whenever one sort of innovators break in upon any article of faith, there always arises behind their backs a new sect, that will refine upon the first, and carry the superstructure further than they ever intended, and to such extravagancies as the principal heretics are ashamed of. Yet some of the Arians, that the party might be stronger against the catholics, struck in with the Macedonians in this too.

The bishops of this council added therefore, as I said, some new clauses, relating to our belief concerning the Holy Spirit, and some other plain things to the body of the Nicene. And the creed by them published is oftener called by the name of the Nicene Creed, than of the Constantinopolitan: and so they themselves desired it should; it being only a second edition of the Nicene with those additions. Nestorius, in his sermons preached at Constantinople about forty years after this time, does often quote the Nicene Creed in defence of his opinion: but the clauses he produces are the words of this. And generally after this time, when we have mention of the Nicene Creed, or faith, we are to understand this, unless where the author does expressly make a distinction.

It is the same (except one word) that is nowadays repeated in the Communion Service by almost all the established churches of Christians in the world. So general an affront does that extravagant author give, that says, ‘All that own it must renounce the ‘numerical unity of God’s essence<sup>m</sup>.’ The copy of it, with a distinction of such clauses as were then added, is this:

281.  
(A.D. 381.) ‘We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

‘And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God: ‘begotten of his Father before all worlds: God of God: light of

<sup>m</sup> [See above, chapter v. § 9. page 424.]

‘light: very God of very God: begotten, not made; being of one  
 ‘substance with the Father: by whom all things were made; [in  
 530.  
 (A.D. 630.) ‘some copies it is added, *both things in heaven and things in*  
*earth* ;] who for us men and for our salvation came down  
 ‘from heaven, and was incarnate *by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin*  
 ‘*Mary*, and was made man, *and was crucified also for us under Pontius*  
 ‘*Pilate*. He suffered; *and was buried*; and the third day he rose  
 ‘again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and  
 ‘sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again to  
 ‘judge the living and the dead; *whose kingdom shall have no end*.

‘And we believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life:  
 ‘who proceedeth from the Father: who with the Father and the Son  
 ‘together is worshipped and glorified: who spake by the prophets.

‘And we believe one catholic and apostolic church. We acknowledge  
 ‘one baptism for the remission of sins. And we look for the resurrection  
 ‘of the dead; and the life of the world to come.’

Whereas in the copies nowadays used in the western church it is said, ‘The Holy Spirit, &c., who proceedeth from the Father and ‘the Son:’ those words, *and the Son*, were added, several hundred years after the making of the creed, by the church of Rome; and so passed into all the western copies: but the eastern churches have them not. And how true soever the doctrine may be, it was not fair for any one part of the church to add the words to the old copy. The Greeks say, he proceeds from the Father *by* the Son.

The chief thing that this creed has more than the old Nicene, is, that the Holy Spirit is ‘Lord, and giver of life.’ The Macedonian heretics had taught that the Holy Spirit is one of the *ministering spirits* mentioned, Heb. i. 14, only greater than the rest. It was in opposition to this, that the catholics testified their faith, that he is (not a ministering or serving spirit, as the angels that are creatures, but,) τὸ Κύριον Πνεῦμα, ‘the Spirit that is the Lord:’ referring to 2 Cor. iii. 17, where St. Paul having at ver. 8, called the gospel *the ministration of the Spirit*, (because in it the power and grace of the Holy Spirit is especially manifested,) and having in prosecution of that discourse spoken to this purpose: that as Moses, when he turned his face to the people, put on a veil; so the Jews reading the law had still a veil over their understandings: but as Moses, when he turned to the Lord put off his veil: so, *when it* [the heart of the people] *shall turn* to the Lord, *the veil shall be taken away*. Now, says he, ὁ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστι, ‘the Spirit is the Lord,’ (which our English has, *the Lord is that Spirit*,) and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is παρρησία, liberty [or an open face without a



veil]. And for the other phrase, ζωοποιῶν, a quickener [or giver of life], it is an attribute of the Spirit, often mentioned in Scripture.

The council of Constantinople was not the first that condemned the Macedonian heresy. The catholics had done it before, from the time of the rise of it, in several particular councils, as they had opportunities in those times of persecution to assemble together. As in that of Alexandria, mentioned by Socrates, lib. iii. cap. 7. And the Illyrican, mentioned by Theodoret, lib. iv. cap. 8. And

262. (A. D. 362.) one at Rome under Damasus, mentioned by

267. (A. D. 367.) Theodoret, lib. ii. cap. 22. And one at Antioch,

270. (A. D. 370.) recited by Holstenius<sup>n</sup>, Collect. Rom. p. 166.

278. (A. D. 378.) But this at Constantinople was the first general

281. (A. D. 381.) council that met after the rise of this heresy.

Whether the Greek church did after these times in their office of baptism make use of this Constantinopolitan copy of the creed, instead of the Nicene properly called; or whether they still use the old one, I know not. But it seems that in the year 476, they kept the old copy; because Basiliscus, in the edict I cited, after having declared that he will maintain the Nicene faith, ‘into which he and ‘all his predecessors were baptized,’ adds; ‘and all things that ‘were enacted in confirmation of that holy creed in this royal city ‘by the one hundred and fifty Fathers, against those that spoke ill ‘of the Holy Spirit.’ This was the Constantinopolitan. Therefore what he said before must be understood of the Nicene properly so called.

XIII. It is wonder that during all the contest about creeds that was in those fifty years of the Arian times, we hear nothing said of the creed used in the church of Rome: especially if they had at that time procured their creed to be called the Apostolic Creed, or the Apostles’ Creed, (as they afterwards did,) it could not have failed but that both the parties would have referred themselves to that. But, on the contrary, there is not a word said of it. Nor can it be known what form of a creed they used in those times. They all along received and owned the Nicene Creed, and renounced all that would not own it: but they do not seem to have applied that to their ordinary offices of baptism; for that use, once begun, would not have been left off again: but to have had a form of their own, as other churches had, before the Nicene, and to have added to it from time to time such clauses as appeared most necessary against any heresies that arose. But still it is a wonder how they, and the

<sup>n</sup> [See ‘L. Holstenii Collectio Romana Veterum Hist. Eccles. Monumentorum,’ 8vo. Romæ, 1662.]

other western churches, could reconcile their practice (in baptizing by any other creed than the Nicene) with those canons of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, which as I shewed<sup>o</sup> did so positively enjoin, that no other should be used for that purpose from that time forward. For these councils, being general ones, must have been ratified by themselves as well as by the eastern bishops: and their popes do to this day swear that they will own and adhere to them.

<sup>300.</sup> About the year 400, we have some light given us how (A. D. 400.) the words of the ordinary creed in the church of Rome stood at that time: but not by any writer of that church, which had but few; but by one whom they do not love. Rufinus, a presbyter of the church of Aquileia, a city in Italy, wrote a comment on the creed<sup>p</sup> as it was worded in his church: and he notes by the way some of the differences or agreements which their church had with the church of Rome and the eastern churches in wording the several clauses. And by his account the Roman Creed at that time must have stood thus:

‘ I believe in God the Father Almighty. And in Jesus Christ  
 ‘ his only Son, our Lord: who was conceived by the Holy Spirit,  
 ‘ of the Virgin Mary: crucified under Pontius Pilate: and buried.  
 ‘ The third day he rose again from the dead: he ascended into  
 ‘ heaven: sitteth at the right hand of the Father: from thence he  
 ‘ shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Spirit.  
 ‘ The holy church. The forgiveness of sins. The resurrection of  
 ‘ the flesh.’

The clause, ‘ Maker of heaven and earth,’ was afterward added out of the Constantinopolitan or other eastern creeds.

‘ The descent of Christ into hades’ (or hell, as we style it in English) was not as yet in the Roman Creed, but was put in afterward. It is expressed in the oldest rule or breviary of faith that is in the world, if there be any credit to be given to those records of the church of Edessa, copied out of the Syriac by Eusebius<sup>q</sup>, and translated by him: where it is said that Thaddæus, one of the Seventy, being sent by Thomas the apostle to cure Abgarus the king, and to convert his people, preached to them, ‘ How Christ came from the  
 ‘ Father; and of the power of his works, &c.; and of the meanness  
 ‘ and lowliness of his outward appearance, &c.; and how he died,  
 ‘ and lowered his divinity: how many things he suffered of the

<sup>o</sup> Sect. 12.

<sup>p</sup> [This was first printed at Oxford in 1468 or 1478; and is subjoined to Goultartus’ edition of St. Cyprian, and subse-

quently to that published by bishop Fell, folio, Oxford, 1682.]

<sup>q</sup> Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. ult. [page 41. ed. Reading.]

‘Jews: and how he was crucified; καὶ κατέβη εἰς τὸν Ἀδην, and ‘descended into hades. And how he sits now on the right hand of God, ‘&c.; and how he will come to judge the living and the dead.’

These things were done, as it is said in that register, the forty-third year: or, as other copies have it, the three hundred and fortieth year: which last, viz. the three hundred and fortieth year of the computation of years used at Edessa, is the same year<sup>r</sup> on which our Saviour ascended into heaven.

<sup>200.</sup> But suppose these records to be forged, yet they must  
(A.D. 300.) have been a good while before Eusebius' time.

Excepting this register, the eldest creeds that have this clause are  
<sup>259.</sup> the Arian ones; viz. that drawn up at Sirmium, and re-  
(A.D. 359.) hearded at the council of Ariminum, mentioned by Soera-  
<sup>259.</sup> tes, lib. ii. cap. 37. That at Nice in Thracia, recited by  
(A.D. 359.) Theodoret, lib. ii. cap. 21. And that at Constantinople,  
<sup>260.</sup> brought into use by Acacius and his party, reported by Socrates,  
(A.D. 360.) lib. ii. cap. 41.

<sup>300.</sup> Rufinus says<sup>s</sup>, it was in his time in the Creed of  
(A.D. 400.) Aquileia, but not in the Oriental Creed, nor in that of Rome: into which last it seems to have been inserted about the  
<sup>500.</sup> year 600; taken perhaps out of the Creed called Athana-  
(A.D. 600.) sius', which about that time is pretended to have been found in some archives at Rome, having never been heard of before.

As for the thing itself, of Christ's descent into hades; though it were not put into the ancient creeds, yet it was ever believed by all Christians: nor could it be otherwise; since they used that phrase in the case of any man that died. And so does the Scripture speak of any man that dies, be he good or bad, as going to *sheol*, (which is the Hebrew word,) or *hades* (which is the Greek for it). Jacob, Gen. xliv. 29. David, Psalm vi. 5. the wicked, Psalm ix. 10. all go to *hades*. To go down to *hades*, or *ad inferos*, was, in their way of speaking, no more than ‘to go down to the dead.’ And if we believe that Christ rose the third day ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, *a mortuis*, ‘from the dead;’ we must believe that three days before, he ‘descended to the dead.’

The clause, ‘everlasting life,’ is commonly judged not to have been in the old Roman Creed. For Rufinus mentions it not in the Aquileian: and he notes no difference between that and the Roman in this particular. And yet there is another reason on the contrary, to think that it was expressed there; because Marcellus, who had

<sup>r</sup> See the note of Valesius on the above passage of Eusebius.

<sup>s</sup> In Symbol. [p. 17. edit. fol. Oxon. 1682.]



made one at the council of Nice, having several enemies of the Arian party in the East that accused him of Sabellianism, by mistake of his meaning, as he pretended, appealed to Julius bishop of Rome and to that church, as to umpires of the quarrel: and when his adversaries would not agree to refer it to that bishop, nor would come thither, he left there a draught of his belief for his perpetual vindication.

274.  
(A.D. 374.)  
300.  
(A.D. 400.) Which draught is set down by Epiphanius', and is exactly the same with the copy of the Roman Creed, given before out of Rufinus, save that it adds this clause at last, 'the life everlasting.' And except this draught, there is no other in antiquity that does very near resemble the Roman Creed. So that it is probable he took the Roman Creed itself for his draught: as thinking that he could not better approve his faith to the church of Rome, than by expressing it in the words of their ordinary creed. And it is possible that Rufinus might omit the collating the Roman Creed with the Aquileian in this point. If this conjecture

240.  
(A.D. 340.)  
300.  
(A.D. 400.) be right, this is the eldest copy of the Roman Creed by sixty years; for this transaction was so long before the time that Rufinus wrote. And not long after Rufinus' time, this clause appears in all the copies.

But, however it were with the Roman Creed, I shewed before out of St. Cyprian, that this clause was in that of Carthage long before. And it was in several eastern ones. Bishop Pearson thinks<sup>x</sup> it was not in the creed used for baptism at Antioch in St. Chrysostom's time, and he takes the ground of that opinion from St. Chrysostom's Homil. 40. in 1 Epist. ad Corinth. But though he be the most exact man that ever wrote, yet he is mistaken in that. St. Chrysostom is there explaining that difficult place, 1 Cor. xv. 29, of some men's being baptized for the dead. He thinks *for the dead* is as much as to say *for their bodies*, i. e. for the resurrection of them, or, in hopes of it. 'For,' says he, 'after all the rest, we add that which St. Paul here speaks of. After the repeating those holy words, &c. (meaning the creed,) we say this at the last of all, when we are to baptize any one; we bid him say, *I believe the resurrection of the dead*: and in this faith we baptize him. For after we have owned that together with the rest, we are plunged down into the fountain of those holy waters.' But though this would make one think that the resurrection was the last article of the creed then used in that church; yet before the end of that homily (and bishop Pearson, it seems, did not at that time read it out)

<sup>t</sup> Hæres. 72. [sect. iii. Op. tom. i. p. 836.]

<sup>u</sup> At § 10.

<sup>x</sup> On the Creed, art. 12.

St. Chrysostom adds, 'And then, since the word *resurrection* is 'not enough to signify the whole of our faith in that matter, ' (because many, that have risen, have died again; as they in the ' Old Testament, as Lazarus, as they at the time of the crucifixion,) ' therefore he [the baptizer] bids him [the baptized person] say, *and* ' the life everlasting; that none may suspect he shall die again after ' that resurrection.'

This creed of the church of Rome has obtained the name of the Apostolic Creed, for no greater or other reason than this; it was a custom to call those churches, in which any apostle had personally taught, especially if he had resided there any long time, or had died there, *apostolic churches*. Of these were a great many in the eastern parts; Jerusalem, Corinth, Ephesus, Antioch, &c.; but in the western parts none but Rome. In which St. Paul and St. Peter had lived a considerable time, and were there martyred. So that any one that in the western parts of the world spoke of the apostolic church, was supposed to mean Rome; that being the only one in those parts, and being called emphatically by all the western Christians *the apostolic church*. And so their bishop came to be called the apostolic bishop; their see, the apostolic see; their faith, the apostolic faith; and among the rest, the creed that they used, the Apostolic Creed.

This name gave handle enough to some people first to imagine, and then by degrees to report a tradition, that this creed was drawn up into this form by the apostles themselves; and so (by a light alteration of the word) to call it, *the Apostles' Creed*.

There was a fable trimmed up, setting forth when and where the apostles met and dictated it; and the reasons why they did it. Which if any one do still believe, he may have ready cure in a treatise of Vossius; or in English, in a treatise of a very learned English gentleman<sup>z</sup>, both written on that subject. If the Roman Christians had believed it themselves, they had done very arrogantly to add from time to time new clauses to the apostles' words.

500. About the year of Christ 600, it seems to have attained (A. D. 600.) that whole form of words which it has now. And being used at Rome as the ordinary creed for the baptized or their god-fathers to repeat, it has been likewise received by all the western churches for the same use. The Greek church do, I think, catechise

<sup>y</sup> De tribus Symbolis. [4to. Amstelodami, 1642; and in the Collection of Vossius' works, 6 vols. folio. 1701.]

<sup>z</sup> Critical History of the Apostles' Creed. [See the history of the Apostles'

Creed, with critical observations on its several articles (published anonymously, by Sir Peter King, afterwards Lord Chancellor of England). 8vo. London, 1703, 1711, &c.]

by the Nicene Creed, but they own this also. When the two great branches of Christendom in the eastern and western empire could not bring their people to use the same form of faith at baptism; yet to shew their unity in the faith, they did each of them receive the other's creed into their liturgies; and both churches do own and use and profess both creeds. And so this is by all owned to be an apostolic creed in one sense, viz. drawn up according to the doctrine of the apostles. But whereas the gentleman I mentioned says<sup>a</sup>, 'it has been for some hundred years preferred before the Nicene;' that is, I think, only in the western church. And where he says<sup>b</sup> that Irenæus repeats the Apostles' Creed, he means only the substance of that faith.

It is general, and it is natural, for every one to say as much as he can in preference of those forms that are in use in his church. But yet upon the whole, I cannot see but that the Greek church have in this the advantage of us, in baptizing by the Nicene. For (besides that theirs is the elder, and acknowledged and enjoined by the first four general councils) the main difference between these two creeds being this, that the western creed (as it is now) has the descent into hell, which the other has not; but the other has the articles of the divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit much more full and express; there is, I think, nobody that doubts but the latter are a much more material point of our faith than the former. But yet in the Roman Creed (as it has always been understood) the clause, *God's only Son*, does mean his Son by nature, and so owns his divinity, as bishop Pearson has shewn. And since it is the settled and notorious interpretation and meaning, they that pronounce it, meaning otherwise, do but equivocate with God and the church. To believe in a person, is, in the phrase of Scripture and of the church, to believe him to be God.

Of Athanasius' Creed there is no occasion of speaking here, both because it was never by any church used at baptism, and also because the composure of it is not so ancient as the times we speak of. Yet it contains the sense of what Athanasius and the other catholics maintained in their disputations against the Arians; but it proceeds also to determine against other heretics that arose long after

240. (A. D. 340.)

330. (A. D. 430.)

348. (A. D. 448.)

Athanasius' time: as Nestorius, that divided the person of Christ into two; and Eutyches, that confounded his two natures into one. And it is penned in a more scholastical style than the ancients had arrived to. The expressions most like it, that are found in any ancient writing, are in that

<sup>a</sup> Critical Hist. p. 47.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. p. 78.



<sup>351.</sup> declaration of the faith made at the council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451.) (which condemned all the said heresies together) recited by Evagrius, lib. ii. c. 4.

What creed the antipædobaptists do require of their candidates to profess, I know not: I am afraid, none at all. I mean no settled form, limited to certain words: but that it is left to the several elders to judge whether each candidate do understand and believe the necessary points of faith. Which must be a very unsafe way: for either the elder himself may be ignorant, or he may hold privately heterodox opinions in the fundamentals of the faith, as Socinianism, &c. For such an one to have the instructing of any young person in his own way, and then to baptize him, is (as Gregory Nazianzen<sup>c</sup> in a case not so bad expresses it) not to dip him, but to drown him. The experience of all ages of the Church has shewn it necessary to have a *form of sound words* for such an use; not to be altered, augmented, or curtailed, by the caprices of every particular pastor.

XIV. These professions of Christian faith, and of renouncing the devil and his works, &c., were by adult persons solemnly made two several times, before they were baptized. Once in the congregation, some time before the day of baptism: where they, standing up and speaking in a continued sentence, said; ‘I renounce the devil and ‘all his works,’ &c., going on through all the clauses of renunciation: and in like manner repeated the whole creed.

And again, just when they were going into the water, by way of answer to the interrogatories of the priest, who laying his hand on the party’s head, solemnly asked the questions severally, ‘Do you ‘renounce the devil?’ &c., he answered, ‘I do.’ And so he asked the other renunciations. And then the belief: ‘Do you believe in ‘God the Father Almighty?’ ‘I do.’ And so the several articles of the creed. And at last; ‘Do you believe the resurrection of the ‘flesh, and the life everlasting?’ he said, ‘I do.’

And therefore that clause in Tertullian which I recited at § 4, is to be pointed thus: ‘We do there (and we do the same also a little ‘before in the congregation) under the hands of the pastor make a ‘profession,’ &c.

St. Austin mentions the former of these times of profession<sup>d</sup> in the case of Victorinus: who was a man in such dignity and repute among the heathen party at Rome, that though he made a pretence of turning Christian, and came sometimes to their assemblies; yet

<sup>c</sup> Orat. in Sanctum Baptisma, prope finem. [Orat. 40. sect. 45. p. 727. edit. Benedict.—Gregory’s words are, *ἡτέλει τὸν*

*βαπτιστὴν ἢ καταβαπτιστὴν.*]

<sup>d</sup> Confess. lib. viii. c. 2. [Op. tom. i. p. 146.]

the Christians did not believe that he would really come over to their religion, (which was even then in contempt among the great men at Rome,) till they saw and heard him, at a certain time when he was at their church, that ‘when the time came of professing the faith, which is wont to be done at Rome in a place a little raised in the sight of the faithful people by those that would come to the grace [viz. of baptism], he with an assured voice pronounced the faith,’ &c.

And St. Hierome mentions the latter<sup>e</sup> when he says, ‘Whereas it is customary at the font, after the confession of the Trinity, to ask, “Do you believe the holy church? Do you believe the forgiveness of sins? &c.”’

But in the case of infants this could be done but once, viz. at the time of their baptism. The baptizer asked the questions, and the sponsors answered in the name of the child. The questions were put severally for each article of the creed and of the renunciation, as in the case of the adult: as appears partly by what I quoted out of St. Austin, part i. ch. 15, sect. 5. § 4. and out of the author of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, part i. ch. xxiii. § 2. And also by what St. Austin says at another place<sup>f</sup>, where speaking of an infant going to be baptized he says, ‘The interrogation is put, “Does he believe in Jesus Christ?” Answer is made, “He does.”’

There is no time or age of the church in which there is any appearance that infants were ordinarily baptized without sponsors or <sup>100.</sup> godfathers. Tertullian mentions the use of them in his (A. D. 200.) time, as I shewed<sup>g</sup>. And I have recited so many other passages wherein they are occasionally mentioned, that there is no need of rehearsing any more on purpose for that matter. St. Austin calls the professions, ‘words of the sacrament, without which an infant cannot be baptized.’ As I shewed, part i. ch. 15. sect. 5. § 5.

XV. The baptized person was quickly after his baptism admitted to partake of the Lord’s supper. This was always and in all places used in the case of adult persons: and in some ages and places in the case of infants. Some have spoken of the custom of giving infants the communion, as if it were anciently as general as the baptizing them: and the antipædobaptists do confidently say it was so. But this has been by others shewn to be a mistake.

Mr. Daillé, in his treatise called the ‘Right Use of the Fathers,’

<sup>e</sup> *Adversus Luciferianos.* [Op. tom. ii. ed. Vallars.]

<sup>f</sup> *Serm. 14. de Verbis Apost.* [or, in the

Benedictine edition, *Serm. 294.* Op. tom. v. p. 1183. see sect. 12.]

<sup>g</sup> Part i. ch. iv. § 9.

bent himself with all his might to find out errors in the Fathers and ancient church. Not indeed with so wicked a purpose as some have done since, that have made use of his instances to take away all credit from the primitive church in conveying down to us the canonical books, and the fundamental doctrines in them delivered: but yet he has made it hard for us to believe what he there says, that he ‘enters upon this inquiry into their errors unwillingly;’ because a man that does so, never makes the faults more or worse than they are. He makes the giving the eucharist to infants one of their chief errors: and to prove that this was their practice, he quotes three authors; Cyprian, Austin, and pope Innocent. And adds, ‘All the rest of the doctors, in a manner, of the first ages maintained that the eucharist was necessary for infants; if at least you dare take Maldonatus’ word, who affirms that this opinion was in great request in the church during the first six hundred years after our Saviour Christ.’ And after this he, several times without any further proof<sup>h</sup>, says absolutely that so it was; ‘That the Fathers, down as far as to the end of the sixth century, held that the eucharist is as necessary to salvation as baptism; and consequently to be administered to infants;’ and concludes from that, as from one of his two chief instances, how little heed is to be given to the practice of the primitive Christians.

And yet all that he quotes from Maldonat, and all that I believe that learned man would say, (for I have not the book,) is this<sup>i</sup>; ‘I pass by the opinion of Austin and Innocent the First, which was in request in the church for above six hundred years, that the eucharist is necessary for infants.’

No man (but one that would fain have it so) would conclude from these words Maldonat’s meaning to be any more than this; <sup>300.</sup> that this opinion began in the time of Austin and Inno- <sup>(A.D. 400.)</sup> cent, anno 400, and continued from thence six hundred <sup>900.</sup> years, to anno 1000 (as it did indeed in some parts of the church), not that it was in request for all the *first* six hundred years.

<sup>312.</sup> Before the year 412, there is no author produced but <sup>(A.D. 412.)</sup> St. Cyprian. And whereas Mr. Daillé speaks with the

<sup>h</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 6. et passim.

<sup>i</sup> Maldonatus in Joan. vi. apud Dalæum, lib. i. cap. 8. [The words of Maldonatus are these: ‘Missam facio Augustini et Innocentii primi sententiam, quæ sexcentos circiter annos viguit in Ecclesia, eucharistiam etiam infantibus necessariam. Res jam ab ecclesia et multo-

rum sæculorum usu, et decreto Concilii Tridentini explicata est, non solum necessarium illis non esse, sed ne licere quidem dari.’—Maldonati Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas, fol. Lut. Par. 1629.—Comm. in Joann. cap. vi. 53. sect. 116.—Compare sect. 109. sqq.]



usual artifice in such cases, as if he singled this out of a great many instances which he could have brought, and says<sup>k</sup>, that St. Cyprian was carried away with the error of his time: the truth of the matter, I believe, is, that neither he nor any body else can find any more. And if we examine what it is that he produces from him, we shall perceive that he has, in his case too, much mistaken the matter; and that, so far from his saying it was necessary, there is no good proof from him that mere infants ever did receive it; though of children of four or five years of age, that then did sometimes in that church receive, there is.

The first proof that is brought, and the most material by far, if it were not from a mistaken edition, is out of the Fifty-ninth Epistle of St. Cyprian, (which is the sixty-fourth in the late edition<sup>l</sup>;) from one word of which epistle he would prove that it was the opinion of Cyprian and of the sixty-six bishops then assembled with him, that the eucharist must be given to infants. But of that epistle you have all that concerns infants in my part i. ch. 6, where I have shewn at § 10, that Mr. Daillé's observation is a mistake in the reading of that one word, and that there is in the correct editions not one syllable about it.

He produces another passage of St. Cyprian, which is the same I quoted out of him in the foresaid ch. vi. § 13. St. Cyprian's commonplace book ran thus; lib. *ad Quirinum*<sup>m</sup>.

C. 25. 'If any one be not baptized and born again, he cannot  
' come to the kingdom of God.'

For proof of this he quotes John iii. 5, 6, item John vi. 53.

C. 26. 'To be baptized and receive the eucharist is not available,  
' unless one do good works.'

For this he quotes 1 Cor. ix. 24: Matt. iii. 10, item vii. 22, item v. 16.

I did indeed bring this place among the proofs of his opinion that infants must be baptized: but owned at the same time, that since infants are not expressly mentioned in it, it would be but a very weak one, were it not that he himself in other places mentions infants by name as contained under the general rule that requires baptism; which he never does in the case of the eucharist. And any one sees that this passage taken alone has much less force to prove their communicating, than it has to prove the necessity of their baptism. If I should, among the testimonies for infants' bap-

<sup>k</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 4.

<sup>l</sup> [Viz. 59 in Pamelius' edition, 64 in that of bishop Fell, and 59 in the Bene-

dictine.]

<sup>m</sup> [P. 72. edit. Fellii, p. 314. ed. Benedict.]

tism, have set down all the sayings of the Fathers, where they speak of baptism as necessary for all persons; those alone would have made a collection larger than mine is: I confined myself to such as mention infants particularly.

But for youths, boys or girls younger than do now commonly receive, he does indeed quote a plain proof out of the book de Lapsis. It is this story which St. Cyprian tells, on purpose to make those that had revolted to idolatry in the late persecution at Carthage sensible of their guilt and of God's wrath; and that they ought not without due confession and penitence approach the holy table<sup>n</sup>.

‘ I will tell you what happened in my own presence. The  
 ‘ parents of a certain little girl, running out of town in a fright,  
 ‘ had forgot to take any care of their child, whom they had left in  
 ‘ the keeping of a nurse. The nurse had carried her to the ma-  
 ‘ gistrates: they, because she was too little to eat the flesh, gave  
 ‘ her to eat before the idol some of the bread mixed with wine,  
 ‘ which had been left of the sacrifice of those wretches. Since that  
 ‘ time her mother took her home. But she was no more capable of  
 ‘ declaring and telling the crime committed, than she had been  
 ‘ before of understanding or of hindering it. So it happened that  
 ‘ once when I was administering, her mother, ignorant of what had  
 ‘ been done, brought her along with her. But the girl being  
 ‘ among the saints could not with any quietness hear the prayers  
 ‘ said; but sometimes fell into weeping, and sometimes into con-  
 ‘ vulsions, with the uneasiness of her mind: and her ignorant soul,  
 ‘ as under a wrack, declared by such tokens as it could, the con-  
 ‘ science of the fact in those tender years. And when the service  
 ‘ was ended, and the deacon went to give the cup to those that  
 ‘ were present, and the others received it, and her turn came; the  
 ‘ girl by a divine instinct turned away her face, shut her mouth,  
 ‘ and refused the cup. But yet the deacon persisted: and put into  
 ‘ her mouth, though she refused it, some of the sacrament of the  
 ‘ cup. Then followed reachings and vomiting. The eucharist could  
 ‘ not stay in her polluted mouth and body; the drink consecrated  
 ‘ in our Lord's blood burst out again from her defiled bowels. Such  
 ‘ is the power, such the majesty of our Lord: the secrets of dark-  
 ‘ ness were discovered by its light: even unknown sins could not  
 ‘ deceive the priest of God. This happened in the case of an infant  
 ‘ who was by reason of her age incapable of declaring the crime  
 ‘ which another had acted on her.’ He goes on to tell how some

<sup>n</sup> Lib. de Lapsis, circa medium, [p. 132. edit. Fell. p. 189. ed. Benedict.]

grown people at the same table, guilty of the same crime, but thinking to conceal it, had been more severely handled; possessed with evil spirits, &c.

This child was probably four or five years old. For the heat of the persecution was about two years before this administering of the sacrament could be, if we reckon the soonest: for St. Cyprian had been almost all that while retired out of the city, as appears by bishop Pearson's *Annals* of that time°. And the child may be guessed by the story to have been two or three years old when she was carried to the idol feast. And so the Magdeburgenses, relating this story p, conclude from it, *puellas ephebas*, that young girls did at this time sometimes receive. And so Salmasius, or else Suicerus himself. *Suiceri Thesaur.* v. Σύναξις.

This passage might have been added to the other quotations that I brought of St. Cyprian for infants' baptism; for no church ever gave the communion to any persons before they were baptized: but I reserved it for this place. This is all, till above four hundred years after Christ's birth; save that in the passage which I, part i. ch. vi. § 11, recited of St. Cyprian *De Lapsis*, there are some words sounding that way.

<sup>317.</sup> Innocent the First, bishop of Rome, does indeed, anno (A. D. 417.) 417, plainly and positively say, that infants cannot be saved without receiving the eucharist: and that in a synodical epistle q written to the Fathers of the Milevitan council. The council had represented to him the mischief of that tenet of the Pelagians, that unbaptized infants, though they cannot go to heaven, yet may have eternal life; which the Pelagians maintained on this pretence, that our Saviour, though he had said, *He that is not born of water cannot enter the kingdom*, yet had not said, *he cannot have an eternal life*. To this, Innocent's words are; 'That which your brotherhood says that they teach, "that infants may without the grace of baptism have eternal life, is very absurd: since, Except they eat the flesh of the Son of man<sup>r</sup>, and drink his blood, they have no life in them,"' &c. His meaning is plainly this; they can have no eternal life without receiving the communion; and they cannot do that, till they be baptized. And it is true what Mr. Daillé urges s; 'That St. Austin says the same thing eight or ten times over in several places of his books.' And some of these

° *Annales Cyprianici*, [prefixed to Fell's edition of Cyprian, 1682.]

p Cent. iii. cap. 6.

q Apud Augustin. Ep. 93. [Epist. 182. ed. Benedict. See it among Innocent's

Epistles, No. 25; in the councils by Mansi, vol. iii. p. 175.]

r John vi. 53.

s Lib. i. cap. 8.



books are dated a little before this letter of Innocent. But though <sup>302.</sup> he wrote a great part of his works before this Innocent (A. D. 402.) was made bishop of Rome, and in them speaks often of infant-baptism; yet it is observable, that he never speaks of infants communicating till after Innocent had been bishop some time: which makes me think it probable that Innocent did first bring up this doctrine of the necessity of this sacrament to infants: for after Innocent had so determined, St. Austin oftener quotes him<sup>s</sup> for it, than he does any place of Scripture.

P. S. I am glad to find so learned a man as John Frith is of the same mind. ‘Answer to More!’ That Innocent was the author of the Necessity of Communicating Infants.

Among all the passages of St. Austin to this purpose, there is need of mentioning but one: and that because some people have said that he at that place does affirm it to be an apostolical tradition; from whence they conclude how little heed is to be given to him, when he says infant-baptism was so. The place is, *De Peccatorum Meritis*, lib. i. cap. 24<sup>u</sup>. He is arguing against the Pelagians, who said, eternal life (though not the kingdom of God) might be had without baptism: and says thus; ‘The Christians of Africa do well call baptism itself one’s salvation; and the sacrament of Christ’s body, one’s life. From whence is this, but, as I suppose, from that ancient and apostolical tradition, by which the churches of Christ do naturally hold that without baptism and partaking of the Lord’s table none can come either to the kingdom of God, or to salvation and eternal life? For the Scripture, as I shewed before, says the same. For what other thing do they hold, that call baptism *salvation*, than that which is said, *He saved us by the washing of regeneration*:’ and that which Peter says, ‘*The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth now save us*? And what other thing do they hold, that call the sacrament of the Lord’s table *life*, than that which is said, *I am the bread of life*, &c.; and, *The bread which I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world*; and, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*? If then, as so many divine testimonies do agree, neither *salvation* nor *eternal life* is to be hoped for by any without baptism and the body and blood of our Lord; it is in vain promised to *infants* without them.’

There is (as I observed a little before) a great difference between

<sup>s</sup> Epist. 106. et alibi, [186 in edit. Benedict.]

<sup>t</sup> [Printed at Munster in 1513: and,

with the works of Tyndal and Barnes, at London, fol. 1573.]

<sup>u</sup> [Op. tom. x. p. 19. ed. Benedict.]

saying, 'There is a tradition or order of the apostles for *infants* to 'receive the eucharist, as a thing without which they cannot be 'saved;' and saying, 'There is a tradition for *all* to receive it, as a 'thing without which they cannot be saved.' For a rule given in general words may be understood with an exception of infants, or without such exception, according as the nature of the thing, or other sayings of the Lawgiver do direct. All the Israelites that do not keep the passover shall be cut off. There very young infants must be excepted. They must all be circumcised. That includes infants, as well as others. Now in the case of baptism, St. Austin and those others whom we have quoted do say, there is a tradition from the apostles for baptizing infants. But all that St. Austin says here, in the case of the eucharist, is in general, that there is an apostolical tradition that none that do not receive it can have salvation. And that this rule should include infants is not said as from the apostles, but is only his own consequence drawn from the general rule; neither do his words import any more: in which consequence there may easily be a mistake.

XVI. After these times of St. Austin and Innocent, there is ever now and then some mention found in the Latin church of infants receiving; Mercator<sup>x</sup>, *subnot.* 8. in the year 435; Gregory (A.D. 435.) the First<sup>y</sup>, *Sacramentar.* anno 590; and so forward till (A.D. 590.) about the year 1000. But toward the latter end of this term, as we learn by the relation of Hugo de Sancto Victore<sup>z</sup>, who lived anno 1100, they gave to infants only the wine, and that only by the priest's dipping his finger in the chalice, and then putting it into the child's mouth for him to suck. And after some time, this also was left off; and instead of it, they gave the new-baptized infant some drops of wine not consecrated, which Hugo dislikes.

This custom of giving common wine to infants seems by some words of St. Hierome<sup>a</sup> to be older in the church of Rome than the custom of giving any consecrated wine. For instead of milk and honey he speaks there (if there be no mistake in the (A.D. 390.) print) of wine and milk given to the new baptized. 'In 'the churches of the west,' says he, 'the custom and type still continues, of giving to those that are regenerated in Christ wine and 'milk.'

<sup>x</sup> [See M. Mercatoris Opera, 2. tom. folio, Paris, 1673.]

<sup>y</sup> [See this in vol. iii. of the Benedictine edition of Gregory's Works, 4 vols. folio, Paris, 1705.]

<sup>z</sup> Lib. iii. de Sacram. cap. 20. [See this

in the collection of 'auctores de Divinis 'Officiis,' &c., quoted above, at page 595.]

<sup>a</sup> Comment. in Esaiam, lib. xv. [Op. tom. iv. ed. Vallars.] Vide Magdeburgenses, Centur. 4. cap. 6.

900. It is to be observed, that about the year 1000, the doctrine of transubstantiation sprung up in the Latin church, which created an excessive and superstitious regard to the outward elements of the eucharist; and had among others this effect, that as the wine was kept from the laymen for fear of slabbering, so the whole sacrament was from infants. And at last the 1460. (A.D. 1560.) council of Trent<sup>b</sup> determined, that ‘it is not at all necessary for them; since being regenerated by the laver of baptism, and incorporated into Christ, they cannot in that age lose the grace of being children of God, which they have now obtained. And yet, say they, antiquity is not to be condemned, if it did sometimes and in some places observe that custom: for as those holy Fathers had a probable reason of their so doing on account of that time [here they should have added, which did not believe transubstantiation]; so it is for certain, and without controversy to be believed, that they did it not on any opinion of its necessity to their salvation.’ And then they pass<sup>c</sup> this anathema: ‘If any one shall say that partaking of the eucharist is necessary for infants, before they come to years of discretion, let him be anathema.’

It is a brave thing to be infallible. Such men may say what they will, and it shall be true. What is a contradiction in other men’s mouths, is none in theirs. Pope Innocent, in a 317. (A.D. 417.) synodical letter sent to the council of Milevis, says; ‘If infants do not eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, [meaning in the sacrament,] they have no life in them.’ 1463. Pope Pius, in confirming the council of Trent, says; ‘If (A.D. 1563.) ‘any man say so, let him be anathema.’

To deny that those ancient Fathers did it with any opinion of its necessity to the infant’s salvation, makes the contradiction yet more palpable; because that is the very thing which they say. The truth, I believe, is, that the Trent Fathers knew that some ancient doctors had commended infants’ receiving: but not that one of their own infallible bishops had so absolutely determined it to be necessary for their salvation.

How soon, or how late, the custom of infants’ receiving came in, in the Greek church, I know not. I do not remember any one ancient writer of that part of the world that speaks of it; I mean of any genuine book: for I know that a mention of it is got into the Clementine Constitutions. But it is a known thing that they use it

<sup>b</sup> Sess. 21. cap. 4.<sup>c</sup> Canon 4.



now, and have done for several centuries; at least most of the branches of that church.

That which I conceive most probable on the whole matter (referring myself to such as have minded this piece of history more) is;

150. 1. That in Cyprian's time, the people of the church of (A.D. 250.) Carthage did oftentimes bring their children younger than ordinary to the communion.

300. (A.D. 400.) 2. That in St. Austin and Innocent's time, it 900. (A.D. 1000.) was in the west parts given to mere infants. And that this continued from that time for about six hundred years.

500. 3. That some time during this space of six hundred (A.D. 600.) years, the Greek church, which was then low in the world, took this custom from the Latin church, which was more flourishing.

4. That the Roman church, about the year 1000, entertaining the doctrine of transubstantiation, let fall the custom of giving the holy elements to infants. And the other western churches, mostly following their example, did the like upon the same account. But that the Greeks, not having the said doctrine, continued, and do still continue, the custom of communicating infants. They think that command of St. Paul, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat, &c.* so to be understood, as not to exclude such as are by their age incapable of examining themselves from partaking, but only to oblige all that are capable. As that like command of his, *If any one will not work, let him have nothing given him to eat*, must be so limited to such as are able to work, as that infants, and such as are not capable to work, must have victuals given them, though they do not work.

The most usual way of giving it to infants in the churches where it is now used, is to mix the bread with the wine, and to put to the child's lips a drop or two of that mixture quickly after his baptism; after which he receives no more till the age of discretion.

XVII. From this custom of the ancients giving the eucharist to infants, the antipædobaptists do draw an argument, (and it is the most considerable that they have for that purpose,) that there is no great stress to be laid on the practice of antiquity in baptizing infants. For they say, since the ancients gave them the eucharist as well as baptism; and yet all Christians are now satisfied that the first was an error in them; what reason have we to regard their opinion or practice in the other?

But, 1. That is not true, that Christians are satisfied that the ancients did ill in giving infants the eucharist; for very near half the Christians in the world do still continue that practice. The Greek church, the Armenians, the Maronites, the Cophti, the Abasens, and the Muscovites; as is related by the late authors, Jeremias, Brerewood, Alvarez, Rycaut, Heylyn<sup>d</sup>, &c. And so, for aught I know, do all the rest of the eastern Christians. And it is probable that the western had done the same, had it not been for the doctrine of transubstantiation coming up in the church of Rome.

2. It is not true that this custom, of giving infants the eucharist, was in the ancient church received either so early or so generally, as baptism of them was. I have, through all the first part, shewn the evidences of their baptism; but for their receiving the eucharist, I know of no other evidences within our period of antiquity, than what I have just now recited. Of which, St. Cyprian does not speak of mere infants; and the other two are dated after the year of Christ 412; and that only in the Latin church. It is a strong  
100.  
(A.D. 200.) presumption that there was no use of it, not even in the church of Carthage, in Tertullian's time; because he, who lived there, and pleaded to have the custom of baptizing infants to be set aside, (except in danger of death,) could not have failed to have given his opinion much rather against the admitting them to that other sacrament, if it had then been used.

3. The grounds of these two practices are nothing of equal force. The words of our Saviour to the Jews, John vi. 53, by which Innocent proves the one, do no way appear to belong to the sacramental eating, which was not then instituted. But his words, John iii. 5, do plainly belong to the other. The passover, which answers to the eucharist, though enjoined in general words to all, yet was not understood to belong to the youngest infants. Circumcision and Jewish baptism, which answer to Christian baptism, were given to infants as well as adult. Baptism has in Scripture the notion and character of an initiating or entering sacrament. The eucharist not

<sup>d</sup> [E. Brerewood, *Enquiries concerning Languages and Religion*, 4<sup>o</sup>. London, 1614, 1622.

Fr. Alvarez, *Historia de las cosas de Ethiopia*, 8<sup>o</sup>. Anvers 1557.—Reprinted in the *Collection of Voyages* by Ramusio, 1588. The original work, in Portuguese, was printed at Lisbon in 1540.—There is a French version, which has gone through several editions.

Sir P. Rycaut, *The present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*, 8<sup>o</sup>. Lond.

1679. See also his '*History of the present State of the Ottoman Empire*,' 8<sup>o</sup>. Lond. 1675.

Sir P. Rycaut, his *History of the Turkish Empire*, from 1623 to 1677, folio, London, 1680.

— *History of the Turks from the year 1679 to 1699*, folio, London, 1700.

P. Heylyn, *Microcosmus*, 4<sup>o</sup>. 1621. 1624. Oxford, 1627.

— *Cosmographie*, folio, 1665, 1677, &c.]

so. Now infants are by the express words of Scripture to be initiated, or entered into covenant, Deut. xxix. 10, 11, 12.

4. However it be, the antipædobaptists cannot make any use of this argument, till they have granted that the ancient Christians did baptize infants. So long as many of them endeavour to keep their people in an opinion that infants' baptism is a new thing, so long they will forbear to tell them that infants did in ancient time receive the eucharist: since, among all the absurdities that ever were held, none ever maintained that, that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized. And if the people among them shall ever be encouraged to search into the history of the Church, to find some proofs of the one, they will at the same time find much fuller proofs of the other, as attested by much ancients authors, and practised more universally; and that when one was left off by the churches that began it, the other has been still continued in all the national churches in the world.

## CHAP. X.

*A summing up of the Evidence that has here been given on both sides.*

THOUGH I pretend to manage the part of a relater of the passages for and against infant-baptism, rather than of a judge of the force and consequence of them, yet it may be proper, now that I have produced all that I know concerning that matter in the eldest times, to sum up in short, for the use of the reader, the evidence that has been given on both sides.

It appears on one side,

I. 1. That as Abraham was taken into covenant by circumcision, an ordinance appointed for him and all the male infants of his race, to enter them into covenant; so when God did, four hundred and thirty years after, establish anew that covenant with that nation under the conduct of Moses, he appointed washing<sup>e</sup>, which is in the Greek tongue called *baptism*, to be another ordinance of entering into it. And that the Jews, as they reckoned it one of the ceremonies, whereby their whole nation, infants as well as grown persons, was then entered into covenant; so when they proselyted or discipled any person of the nations, they did use to wash or baptize him; because the law had said, *One law and one manner shall be for you and for the stranger [or proselyte] that sojourneth with you<sup>f</sup>*. And if that proselyte had any infant children, male or female, they baptized

<sup>e</sup> Exod. xix. 10.

<sup>f</sup> Numb. xv. 16.



them, as well as the parents; and they counted and called them *proselytes* or *discipled* persons, as well as they did the parents. Also, that if they bought, or found, or took in war, any infants whom they intended to make *proselytes* or *disciples* in their religion, they did it by baptizing them. For this, see Introduction, § 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7.

This gives light for the understanding of our Saviour's commission, *Go and disciple all nations, baptizing them*. Whereas before, only now and then one out of the neighbour nations had been made a *disciple* or *proselyte*, they were now all to be *discipled*: and (since nothing is said to the contrary) in the same manner as those before had been.

2. That the Jews did use to call that their baptism by the name of *regeneration*, or *a new birth*. They told the *proselytes*, that how unclean, sinful, or accursed soever he or his children were before, they were now by this baptism dedicated to the true God, entered into a new covenant with him, put into a new state, and were in all respects as if they had been new-born. Also, that the heathens before Christ's time had a custom of baptizing, and that they also called it *regeneration*. See Introduction, § 6. and book, part i. ch. 4. § 11.

This gives light to our Saviour's expression, where he, after the Christian baptism now brought into use by John Baptist and himself, tells Nicodemus<sup>h</sup>, that to be *regenerated*, or *born again of water and the Spirit*, was absolutely necessary for any one's coming to *the kingdom of God*: and to St. Paul's styling baptism *the washing of regeneration*<sup>i</sup>.

3. That accordingly all the ancient Christians, not one man excepted, do take the word *regeneration*, or *new birth*, to signify *baptism*; and *regenerate*, *baptized*. And that our Saviour's said words to Nicodemus do so stand in the original, and are so understood by all the ancients, as to include all persons, men, women, or children; part i. ch. 2. § 4, 5, 6. ch. iii. § 2, 3, 4, 5, 8. ch. iv. § 3, 6. ch. vi. § 13. ch. xi. § 2. ch. xii. § 8. ch. xiii. § 2. and all the other chapters.—part ii. ch. vi. § 1, 7. And that by *the kingdom of God* there is meant *the kingdom of glory*, is proved from the plain words of the context, and from the sense of all ancient interpreters, part ii. ch. 6. § 1.

4. The necessity of baptism to entrance into God's kingdom, was a declared Christian doctrine before St. John had recorded those words of our Saviour, part i. ch. 1. § 2, 3, 7.

5. Clement in the apostles' time, and Justin Martyr about forty years after, do speak of original sin as affecting infants, part i. ch. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19.

<sup>h</sup> John iii. 3, 5.

<sup>i</sup> Tit. iii. 5.

§ 1. ch. 2. § 1. And Justin Martyr [40. (A.D. 140.)] does speak of baptism as being to us instead of circumcision, part i. ch. 2. § 2. So also does St. Cyprian, [150. (A.D. 250.)] part i. ch. 6. § 1. and Nazianzen, [260. A.D. 360.)] part i. ch. xi. § 7. and St. Basil, [260. (A.D. 360.)] ch. xii. § 5. and St. Chrysostom, [290. (A.D. 390.)] ch. xiv. § 1. and St. Austin, [296. (A.D. 396.)] *ibid.* the three last expressly calling it, in St. Paul's phrase, *the circumcision made without hands*: and St. Cyprian, the 'spiritual circumcision.' Origen [110. (A.D. 210.)] also says that Christ 'gives us circumcision by baptism.' Homil. 5. in Jos.

6. Irenæus, [67. (A.D. 167.)] born about the time of St. John's death, and probably of Christian parents, is proved particularly to use the word *regenerating* for *baptizing*: and he mentions infants as being ordinarily regenerated, ch. iii. § 2, 3, 4, 5. And Justin Martyr [40. (A.D. 140.)] before him speaks of infants or children as being made disciples to Christ, part i. ch. 2. § 7.

7. Origen, [110. (A.D. 210)] Ambrose, [374. (A.D. 474.)] and Austin, [296. (A.D. 396.)] do each of them expressly affirm, that baptizing infants was ordered by the apostles, and practised in their time. And Clemens Alexandrinus [92. (A.D. 192)] plainly intimates the same; part i. ch. iii. § 9. ch. v. § 3. ch. xiii. § 1. ch. xv. sect. 4. § 3. item sect. 6. § 2. Of these, Origen had both his father and grandfather Christians: and he himself was born but eighty-six years after the apostles; so that probably his grandfather was born within the apostles' time; or at least very nigh it, part i. ch. 5. § 9. And Clemens Alexandrinus flourished himself within ninety-two years of the apostles.

8. Tertullian, [100. (A.D. 200.)] though he give his opinion unconsistently, and do at one place advise the delay of infants' baptism, yet at the same place speaks of it as a thing customarily received, part i. ch. 4. § 3, 4, 5, 9. where he also makes baptism absolutely necessary to salvation.

9. That place of Scripture, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*, [or sanctified,] is interpreted of their baptism as then given, or to be given before they can actually be reckoned holy; by Tertullian, [100. (A.D. 200.)] part i. ch. 4. § 12. St. Hierome, [278. (A.D. 378.)] part i. ch. 18. § 4. Paulinus, [293. (A.D. 393.)] *ibid.* St. Austin, [296. (A.D. 396.)] part i. ch. 15. sect. 2. Pelagius, [305. (A.D. 405.)] ch. xix. § 19. And that *ἅγιοι*, *holy*, [or saints, or sanctified, or Christians,] is as much as to say *baptized*, part i. ch. 11. § 11; ch. vi. § 1. Origen also appears so to have understood it, part i. ch. 19. § 19. No. 4.

10. In St. Cyprian's time, [150. (A.D. 250.)] a question being put among sixty-six bishops, whether an infant must be kept till eight days old, before he be baptized; not one was of that opinion, part i. ch. vi. § 1. And to put the rest together, the words of the council of Eliberis, [205. (A.D. 305.)] part i. ch. 7. Of Optatus, [260. (A.D. 360.)] ch. ix. § 2. Of Gregory Nazianzen, [260. (A.D. 360.)] ch. xi. § 2, 4, 6, 7. Of St. Ambrose, [274. (A.D. 374.)] ch. xiii. § 1, 2. Of St. Chrysostom, [280. (A.D. 380.)] ch. xiv. § 1, 3, 5. Of St. Hierome, [293. (A.D. 393.)] ch. xv. § 1; ch. xix. § 26. Of St. Austin, [296. (A.D. 396.)] ch. xv. *per totum*. Of Bonifacius, [308. (A.D. 408.)] *ibid.* sect. 5. § 4. More of St. Austin, ch. xix. and xx. *per totum*. Of a council of Carthage, [297. (A.D. 397.)] ch. xvi. § 3, 4, 5, 6. Of a council of Hippo, [290. (A.D. 390.)] *ibid.* § 5. Of Siricius, [284. (A.D. 384.)] ch. xvii. § 3, 6. Of Innocentius, [302. (A.D. 402.)] ch. xvii. § 7, 8; ch. xix. § 28. Of Paulinus, [293. (A.D. 393.)] ch. xviii. § 1, 3. Of another Paulinus, [297. (A.D. 397.)] *ibid.* § 6. Of Cœlestius, [312. (A.D. 412.)] ch. xix. § 5, 31, 35, 36. Of Pelagius, [317. (A.D. 417.)] ch. xix. § 29, 30. Of Zosimus, [318. (A.D. 418.)] *ibid.* § 33. Of the council of Milevis, [316. (A.D. 416.)] *ibid.* § 28. Of another council of Carthage, *ibid.* And of another, [318. (A.D. 418.)] ch. xix. § 37. Of Vincentius Victor, [319. (A.D. 419.)] ch. xx. § 2, 3, 4, 5. Of Julian, [320. (A.D. 420.)] ch. xix. § 38. Of Theodorus, [331. (A.D. 431.)] *ibid.* § 39. Of Pseudo-Clement, ch. xxiii. § 1. Of Pseudo-Dionysius, *ibid.* § 2. Of the author of the *Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos*, *ibid.* § 3. Of the author of the *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, *ibid.* The words of these, and of all the rest here cited, do shew that infants were baptized in their times: and that without controversy. There is not one man of them that pleads for it, or goes about to prove it, as a thing denied by any one: save that the Pseudo-Dionysius answers the objections that the heathens made against it; which are much the same that the antipædobaptists have made since.

11. St. Austin mentions it among the things that have not been instituted by any council, but have been ever in use. And says, 'The whole church of Christ has constantly held that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sin.' And, that 'he never read or heard of any Christian, catholic or sectary, that held otherwise.' And expressly says; 'That no Christian man of any sort [*nullus Christianorum*] ever denied it to be useful or necessary.' Meaning of those that allow any baptism at all, part i. ch. xv. sect. 4. § 3. sect. 6. § 2; ch. xix. § 7. item 17.

<sup>315.</sup>  
(A.D. 415.) 12. The Pelagians, who denied that infants have any need of forgiveness of sin, and were most of all pressed



with that argument, 'Why are they then baptized?' did never offer to deny that they are to be baptized: but do expressly grant that they have ever been wont to be baptized; and that no Christian, no not even any sectary, did ever deny it, part i. ch. xix. § 24. 26. 29, 30, 31, 32. 35, &c. ad 40. Part ii. ch. 4. § 1. 3.

60. 13. And for the other heretics of these times; there (A. D. 160.) appears not (by examining the many varieties of opinions (A. D. 400.) that they held) any sign that any of them that used any baptism at all, denied it to infants, part i. ch. 15. sect. 4. § 4; ch. xvi. § 1, 2; ch. xxi. § 1. 4.

14. It is held by all these ancient Christians, that no children dying unbaptized can come to the kingdom of heaven, part i. ch. 4. § 3, 6, 7, 8; ch. vi. § 9, 13, 14; ch. xi. § 6, 7; ch. xii. § 5; ch. xiii. § 2; ch. xiv. § 2; ch. xv. sect. 3. § 2; ch. xvi. § 3, 4, 5, 6; ch. xviii. § 4, 5; ch. xix. § 24. 28; ch. xx. § 6; ch. xxiii. § 3; part ii. ch. 6. § 4, 5, 6. St. Austin in the last of these places says, there was in this matter 'Christianorum populorum concordissima fidei conspiratio,' the most uniform consent of all Christian people [or nations]. And that the Pelagians themselves were overruled by it, and owned it to be true.

Vincentius Victor was the only man that is known to affirm the contrary. He maintained once, that by God's extraordinary (A. D. 418.) mercy and the prayers of the church this might be obtained: but he also recanted, ch. xx. § 3, 4, 5; yet they all grant that infants so dying have little or (as some say) no punishment.

But they hold, *nemine contradicente*, that all baptized infants, dying in infancy, are glorified; part i. ch. 6. § 9; ch. xi. § 6, 7; ch. xv. sect. 3. § 2. item sect. 5. § 6: part ii. ch. vi. §. 9.

15. They do accordingly speak of it as a great sin in parents, or others that have opportunity, to suffer any child under their care, or any other person, to die unbaptized, part i. ch. 4. § 4; ch. vi. § 1. 9; ch. xv. § 1; ch. xvii. § 3: part ii. ch. 3. sect. 6. § 7. And they represent it as great piety and compassion in those that procure an infant that has been exposed in the streets by an unnatural mother, to be baptized, part ii. ch. 6. § 9. And when for the more orderly administration of baptism they enact that none shall be baptized but at certain times of the year, they always except infants and sickly persons, part i. ch. xvii. § 3. for which reason also many of them allow a layman to baptize in case of necessity, part i. ch. iv. § 4.

100. 16. They shew that they have considered those reasons (A. D. 200.) which the antipædobaptists do now make use of, as objec-

tions against the baptizing of infants : as that they have no sense, no faith, no actual sin, &c., and yet do not count them sufficient reasons to forbear the baptizing them, part i. ch. 14. § 3 ; ch. xv. sect. 3 ; item sect. v. § 1. 4. 9 ; ch. xix. § 18.

100. 17. The use of godfathers in infants' baptism is proved (A. D. 200.) to have been the custom of the Jews in baptizing the infants of proselytes, Introduction, § 3, 4. and of Christians afterwards, by quotations from the year after the apostles 100, and all along this period, part i. ch. 4. § 9 ; ch. xv. sect. 4. § 3 ; item sect. v. § 3, 4, 5 ; ch. xix. § 7 ; ch. xxii ; ch. xxiii. § 2 : part ii. ch. 9. § 9, 14.

18. This also makes one evidence ; that the proofs which some of the antipædobaptists have, after their best search, pretended to bring of any church or any sect of Christians in these elder times, that did not baptize infants, are found to be falsely recited, or mistaken, or not to the purpose, part i. ch. 15. sect. 4. § 3, 4 : part ii. ch. 1. § 2, 3, 4, 5 ; ch. ii. § 15 ; ch. iv. § 1, 2, 3.

And even the instances of particular men, whom they would prove to have been born of Christian parents, and yet not baptized in infancy, do all (or at least all but one) fail of any tolerable proof, part ii. ch. 3. *per totum*.

19. The sense of all modern learned men that do read these ancient books, except those few specified, is, that these books do give clear proof that infant-baptism was customary in the times of those authors, and from the apostles' time, part ii. ch. 2. § 1, 16. There are but three or four that think otherwise. And Menno himself, the father of the present antipædobaptists, granted this to be true, part ii. ch. 8. § 5.

20. Lastly, as these evidences are for the first four hundred years, in which there appears only one man, Tertullian, that advised the delay of infant-baptism in some cases ; and one Gregory, that (A. D. 200.) did perhaps practise such delay in the case of his child (A. D. 330.) dren, but no society of men so thinking, or so practising : nor no one man saying it was unlawful to baptize infants : so in the to 1000. next seven hundred years, there is not so much as one man to be found that either spoke for, or practised, any such delay. But all the contrary, part i. ch. 22. *per totum* ; part ii. ch. 7. § 1.

1030. And when about the year 1130, one sect among the (A. D. 1130.) Albigenses declared against the baptizing of infants, as being incapable of salvation, the main body of that people rejected that their opinion ; and they of them that held that opinion quickly dwindled away, and disappeared ; there being no more heard of

1422. holding that tenet, till the rising of the German antipædobaptists, anno 1522, part ii. ch. 7. § 2, 3, 4, &c.

And that all the national churches now in the world do profess and practise infant-batism, part ii. ch. 8. § 1, 2, 3.

II. The reasons and evidences for the other side ought to be divided into two sorts. For there are some of them which really have all the force that they seem to have; but some others of them must indeed pass for reasons, or for good evidence, to one that understands only the vulgar translation of the Scripture, and only the present state of the nations of the world, and of religion: but do lose their force, when one searches into the originals of the Scripture, or when one comprehends the history of the state of religion in the world, at that time when the books of the New Testament or the books of the ancient Christians were written.

I will first sum up that evidence which I take to be of the first sort.

1. It does not appear that the Jewish baptism of infants in our Saviour's time (according to which the pædobaptists supposed the apostles were to regulate theirs, in all things not otherwise directed by our Saviour) was in all respects like to that which the Christian pædobaptists do practise. For the Jews seem to have baptized the infants of such only as were proselyted, or made disciples out of the heathen nations, and infants taken in war, found, bought, &c.; but not their own infants. They thought their own infants to be clean without it; clean by their birth, being of a nation which had been once universally sanctified by baptism. Introduction, p. 3.

This, supposing it to have some weight against infant-baptism, as the Christians do practise it; yet does not make for the antipædobaptists' practice neither. For they (as well as the pædobaptists) do hold that all persons are now to be baptized at some age or other (persons born of Christian parents, as well as those that are born of heathens). Which being granted, the example of the Jewish baptism directs it to be done in infancy: for all whom the Jews baptized at all, they baptized in infancy, if they had then the power of them. And besides, the exception of Jews or Jews' children from the obligation to baptism, was understood by themselves to be a thing that was to continue only till the coming of the Christ, or of the Elias, Introduction, § 3, 5, *et ult.* Since which time the Jews are, as to matter of baptism, brought to the same state as Gentiles. Which does take off all the force of this reason or evidence.

2. As to the argument taken from the practice of the ancient Christians, considered in general; it is some weakening of the force



of it, that some of those ancients who baptized infants, did also give them the communion: some, I say, but not very many; and those, none of the most ancient, part ii. ch. 9. § 15, 16, 17. Now though a man's error in one thing does not necessarily prove that he errs in another; yet when it is in relation to the same subject, it gives some abatement to his authority. And though it be to this day controverted between the eastern and western Christians, whether this be an error, or not; yet the pædobaptists of these parts of the world must, in their pleas against the antipædobaptists, yield it to be an error: because they themselves do not use it. And so it is (for as far as its force reaches) *argumentum ad hominem* at least.

3. As to particular men among the ancients; Tertullian advises  
100. the delay of infant-baptism (in ordinary cases where there  
(A. D. 200.) is no apparent danger of death) till they come to the age of understanding: and then further, till they are married, or else by their age are past the danger of lust, part i. ch. iv. § 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

As for any value that is to be put upon Tertullian's judgment or opinion, as a single man, I ought to have put this among the second sort of evidence, which is of little or no force with such as do understand the history of that time: because all that do so, do know that he was accounted (both in his own time, and also by those who after his death spoke of him or his works) a man of odd, rash, singular, and heterodox tenets in many other things: and that in the latter part of his life he turned (as men of that temper commonly do) a downright heretic in some fundamental points of the faith, part i. ch. 4. § 1, 13. So that his opinion or judgment was never esteemed of any value.

And for his testimony as a witness of the then practice, his speaking against infant-baptism is as good evidence that it was then customary, as theirs that mention it with approbation.

110. But this I think has some weight: that if Tertullian  
(A. D. 210.) had known of any such tradition or order left 'by the 'apostles,' as Origen who lived at the same time speaks of, to baptize infants; he, as heady as he was, would not then have spoken against the doing of it. Especially if the book where he does this, was written (as Dr. Allix judges it was) while he continued in the catholic church.

This therefore may be concluded, that either there was no good account of such a tradition, or else that Tertullian had never heard  
86. of it. Which last is not at all improbable: for Origen,  
(A. D. 186.) living most of his time in Palestine, where the apostles had much and long conversed, and being born of Christian ancestors

in Ægypt not far off, might very well have good proof of an order left by the apostles, and sure footsteps of their practice; of which Tertullian, born of heathen parents, and living at Carthage, (a place where no apostle ever came, nor nigh it by a great distance,) might at that time have heard nothing.

However it be, the antipædobaptists must make much of this man. For he is the only one of all the ancients that had this opinion. So says Mr. Du Pin<sup>k</sup>, who has with the greatest accuracy searched their works, and with the greatest fidelity reported them: he, in reciting this passage of Tertullian, observes; ‘one finds no other writer in all antiquity that speaks at this rate.’ And so the Magdeburgenses<sup>l</sup>; Tertullian ‘by a strange opinion holds,’ &c.

4. But though there be never another that advises such a delay  
 225. of baptism, yet there is a probability that one that lived  
 (A.D. 335.) about one hundred and thirty years after that time, in another part of the world, practised such a delay: viz. Gregory the father of Gregory Nazianzen. He seems to have suffered all his children, even those that were born to him after his baptism, to grow up to a full age without baptizing them. This matter of fact is discussed with the evidence *pro* and *contra*, part ii. ch. iii. sect. 6. § 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

As Tertullian’s character was, that he was learned and ingenious, but hot and heady: so this man seems on the other side to have been ignorant, and of mean capacities. Only his son indeed does, as duty required, speak honourably of him.

If he had been a man much spoken of, it would have made a better argument (than his practice now does) that leaving children unbaptized was no unusual thing, because his doing so is not mentioned with any censure or wonder by any author of that time. But as he was a man little regarded, and placed in an obscure and remote corner, and never mentioned but only by the writers of his son’s life, (who lived six hundred years after,) this cannot be expected. There is in elder times no mention of his name at all, but what we have from his son: and had it not been for him, it would not have been known that such a place as Nazianzum, or such a bishop of it as this elder Gregory, had ever been. And it was not for the Son to reflect on any faults or neglects of his father. He does do that, as far as could be seemly for him, when he admonishes his people against any such neglect. Of which admonitions of his I give several instances in part i. ch. xi. § 2, 4, 6, 7. In one of

<sup>k</sup> Bibliothèque Nouvelle, vol. i. de Tertulliano.

<sup>l</sup> Cent. 3. cap. 4. Inclinatio Doctrinæ de Baptismo.

them indeed he does (perhaps out of some compliance to his father's practice) advise, that if there appear no danger of the child's death, the baptism should be delayed till he be about three years old. But that helps this cause but little: both because a child at three years old is as incapable of receiving baptism upon his personal profession as a mere infant: and also because he at other places urges the speedy administering of it in general; and so he does at this place, if any danger of death do appear.

This evidence therefore of Gregory's father, as I would not omit it (let it have what weight it will bear); so I cannot reckon it to have any great force, being but one man's practice, and that of a man of little judgment or credit.

5. That argument for the universal consent of antiquity in baptizing infants, which is taken from the declaration of St. Austin [that he never read or heard of any Christian, catholic, or sectary, that denied that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sin] and from <sup>316.</sup> the grant of Pelagius [that he also never heard of any  
(A. D. 416.) that denied that they are to be baptized]:—that argu-  
<sup>100.</sup>  
(A. D. 200. ment, I say, is something weakened by this; that Tertul-  
lian, two hundred years before their time, is found to have spoken  
against it; at least as ordinarily practised: so that from hencefor-  
ward that rule must proceed with an exception of one man, viz.  
Tertullian.

6. The Petrobrusians, one of those societies of men called Albi-  
<sup>1000.</sup> genses, withdrawing themselves about the year 1100 from  
(A. D. 1100.) the communion of the church of Rome, which was then  
very corrupt, did reckon infant-baptism as one of the corruptions;  
and accordingly renounced it, and practised only adult-baptism,  
part ii. ch. 7. § 5, 6, 7.

An exception that abates in great measure the force of the evidence from these men's practice, is this; that (besides that they were very late and very few) they did what they did on this principle; that no infant, baptized or not, can come to heaven; which is by both the parties now acknowledged to be a great and an uncharitable error.

These evidences, how much or how little soever they weigh, or avail toward the determining the point, are however to be reckoned among true ones: that is, they are true, and not mistaken matters of fact.

III. But there is, as I said, another sort of evidences and reasons against infant-baptism, which are apt to weigh much with one that understands not the state of the times spoken of, and can read only



the vulgar translation of the Scripture; and such a man cannot much be blamed for taking them as good reason or evidence: but they lose their force with any one that is not under those disadvantages. And such I reckon these following:

1. There are several ancient books that say nothing at all about infant-baptism, neither for it nor against it. And it is wonder, say some antipædobaptists, if it were common in those times, that these as well as others should not mention it.

A pompous recital of the names of these makes an unlearned antipædobaptist think that they are so many authors on his side. But any one that understands how the ancient Christian writers were mostly employed, viz. in defending the truth and innocence of their religion against the objections and slanders of heathens and Jews; in encouraging the persecuted people to bear with faith and patience the obloquy and sufferings they lay under, &c.; such a man, instead of wondering that there are no more, will wonder there are so many, that do happen in such their writings to mention so particular a thing as the baptizing of children. Especially since in the primitive times there was no controversy started about that point. Now that it is become a controversy; yet let any man go into a bookseller's shop, and take down ten books at all adventures; and he will find above half of them to be such as have no mention *pro* nor *contra* about infant-baptism; because they are written on such subjects as give no occasion for it. It is the nature of a man whose head is hot with any controversy, to wonder he does not find something about that in every book and chapter he reads.

Mr. Tombes made a plea of this. But he was too candid a disputant to lay much stress on it. He takes notice of five authors that have nothing about it. Mr. Stennet takes two of his, and<sup>m</sup> reckons up six more, who, he says, have nothing of it. I gave reasons, I hope, satisfactory enough, why in Mr. Tombes' authors no mention of such a thing could be expected, part i. ch. 21. § 4, 5. And the same are applicable to those produced by Mr. Stennet; save that he reckons Irenæus for one; who, as I shew, part i. ch. 3, speaks plainly enough of it. And also I have shewn, part i. ch. 1. and 2, that three more of them, Clemens Romanus, Hermas, and Justin Martyr, though not speaking directly of it, do mention things from whence inferences may be drawn for the proof of it. And have now also produced one from another of them: viz. Clemens Alexandrinus.

The very same remark, I think, ought to be made upon that ob-

<sup>m</sup> Answer to Russen, p. 68.

jection against infant-baptism which the antipædobaptists do much insist on; viz. that St. Luke, in reciting the lives and acts of the apostles, does not mention any infants baptized by them. Whoever observes the tenor of that history, and considers the state of those times, will perceive that St. Luke's aim is to give a summary account of the main and principal passages of their lives; and of those passages especially, in which they found the greatest opposition. And in such a history, (which is but short in all,) who can look for an account of what children they baptized? Suppose that the life and actions of some renowned and laborious modern bishop or doctor were to be written (say of bishop Ussher, Stillingfleet, &c.), and that, in a volume ten times as long as the book of the Acts of the Apostles: who will expect to find there any account of what children they christened? And yet there is no doubt but they did christen hundreds, or (if we take in what was done by ministers deputed by them) thousands. The main business of an apostle was to preach, convert, attest the truth of Christ's resurrection, miracles, &c.; and *not to baptize*, as St. Paul says<sup>n</sup>. The baptizing of such as the apostles had convinced, and especially of their children, would of course be left to deputies. Yet of the six baptisms (which are all that St. Paul is mentioned to have been concerned in), three were the baptisms of whole households<sup>o</sup>: such an one *and all his*. And that is as much as can reasonably be expected of so minute a circumstance.

67. 2. Irenæus, who is the eldest of the Fathers in whom (A. D. 167.) the pædobaptists have as yet found any positive mention of infants as baptized, does not at that place use the word itself *baptized*, but the word *regenerated* or *born again*, part i. ch. 3. § 2.

This may invalidate his testimony with one that knows of no other sense of that word than what is common in modern English books. But any man that has been at all conversant in the Fathers, or that has read but those passages of them that are in this my collection, or but even those to which I referred just now at No. 3, and No. 5, of the Evidences for Infant-baptism; will be satisfied that they as constantly meant *baptized* by the word *regenerated*, [or *born again*,] as we do mean the same by the word *christened*.

To be satisfied of this (and I do assure any one that will search, that he shall not miss of satisfaction) is very well worth a pædobaptist's while. For the testimonies of Irenæus and of Justin Martyr, so near the times of the apostles, are preferable for their antiquity to the testimony of any three or four others.

<sup>n</sup> 2 Cor. i. 17.

<sup>o</sup> Acts xvi. 15, 35. 1 Cor. i. 16.

<sup>260.</sup> 3. St. Basil in a certain sermon speaks so as plainly to  
 (A. D. 360.) suppose that a great part of his auditory was made up of  
 such as had been instructed in the Christian religion from their infancy,  
 and yet not baptized, part i. ch. 12. § 2, 3.

I have reason to reckon this among the evidences that may appear  
 to people of little reading, and to such as have but a shallow and  
 superficial knowledge of the state of the ancient times, to have a  
<sup>260.</sup> great weight against the belief of any general practice of  
 (A. D. 360.) infants' baptism at that time; because it had such an  
 effect upon myself. I thought, upon the first reading of this place,  
 nothing could be a plainer proof that the Christians then did not  
 commonly baptize their children in infancy, than this evidence of a  
 church full of people; a considerable part of whom had been cate-  
 chised from their infancy, and were not yet baptized. Such a  
 number of heathen converts had been easily to be accounted for:  
 but these seemed born of Christian parents, because he says, 'From  
 ' a child catechised in the word.'

But all this argument lost its force with me, when by further  
 reading I perceived (and wondered at myself afterward, as is com-  
 mon, why I had not perceived before) that which I shew in the  
 same chapter, and also part ii. ch. 3. sect. 1. to have been the state  
 of the world as to religion at that time: viz. that beside those that  
 were heathens on one side, and those that were professed or baptized  
 Christians on the other, there was a vast number of a middle sort:  
 half converts, heathen men converted thus far, that they were con-  
 vinced that Christianity was the true religion, and that they must  
 be baptized into it some time or other: but not being willing as yet  
 to abandon their lusts, they put it off from time to time. These  
 men did, as many wicked men do now, instruct their children in the  
 godly precepts of religion; but they could not offer them to baptism  
 till they were baptized themselves. And those that St. Basil speaks  
 to, had been the children of such men.

We see a woful example in our churches of a much like nature.  
 Many wicked men do at times resolve to become serious some time  
 or other: and then they think they will come to the holy commu-  
 nion, and engage themselves to a godly life. They put off this from  
 time to time, many times till death seizes them. These men, if they  
 had been born of heathens, and not yet baptized, but yet had come  
 to the knowledge of Christianity, would put off their baptism as they  
 now do the other sacrament; much at the rate as the fathers of  
 those to whom St. Basil preaches had done their baptism, and as he  
 complains the sons also, to whom he preaches, did. And as we see



now, that nigh half the world of nominal Christians are such procrastinators; so there seems to have been not a much less proportion among the catechumens then. And as the Fathers do speak of those who were during this dilatory course seized with death, as lost men; so I doubt it is but poor comfort that we can give to men so seized, that have for like reasons all their life long put off the receiving the communion; viz. because they would not yet repent.

But still this state of religion in St. Basil's time does not prove, that any who were once baptized themselves, did delay or put off the baptizing of their children.

4. Some arguments against infants' baptism have all their strength from that imperfect conception of things, which arises from one's reading only the vulgar translations of Scripture, and do vanish when one consults the originals. That commission of our Saviour to the apostles, Matt. xxviii. 19, which is in the English, *Go—and teach all nations; baptizing them, &c.—teaching them to observe, &c.* as it affords on one side this argument for pædobaptism; 'infants are part of the nations; and so to be baptized by this commission:' so on the other side it gives occasion to the antipædobaptists to retort, and say; 'infants are such a part of the nation as are not capable of being taught; and so not to be baptized.'

But the word which is translated *teach*, in the first of those clauses, has a peculiar signification in the original, and is not the same word as that which is translated *teaching*, in the second<sup>p</sup>: but signifies much like what we say in English; to *enter any one's name* as a scholar, disciple, or proselyte, to such a master, school, or profession. Now the common language of the Jews, (in which language it was that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel,) as it does not admit of this phrase, *an infant is taught, or instructed*; so it very well allows of this other; *such or such an infant is entered a disciple, or made a proselyte* to such a profession or religion. And the Jews did commonly call a heathen man's infant, whom they had taken and circumcised and baptized, *a young proselyte*; as I shewed in the introduction. And St. Peter, speaking against the imposing of circumcision on the heathen converts and their children, words it thus; *to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples*: whereas it was infants especially, on whom this yoke was attempted to be put, Acts xv. 10. And St. Justin, as I shewed in the first part, chap. ii. § 6, expressly mentions infants, or at least children, as *made disciples*,

40. in the very same word that is used by St. Matthew in (A. D. 140.) that place. And when he speaks of people *baptized in the*

<sup>p</sup> [In the first clause we read *μαθητεύσατε*, in the second *διδάσκοντες*.]

name of Christ, uses the same word; μαθητευόμενοι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. As in his *Dialog.* p. 57. ed. Steph.<sup>1</sup> He says; ‘God has ‘not hitherto brought on, nor does yet bring on, the day of judgment; γνώσκων ἔτι καθ’ ἡμέραν τινὰς μαθητευομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ. “Knowing that there are still every day some ‘discipled into the name of his Christ,” and withdrawn from the ‘way of error.’ Where that he by “discipled in the name of Christ,” means, “baptized in his name,” is apparent by the next words, which are; ‘Who do also receive gifts, every one as he is ‘worthy, when they are enlightened [or baptized, φωτιζόμενοι] in the ‘name of this Christ. For one receives the spirit of understanding; ‘another of counsel; another of strength; another of healing; another ‘of foreknowing, [or foretelling things, προγνώσεως]’ &c. These and such like gifts of the Spirit did, it seems, continue in his time to be given to Christians at their baptism.

And whereas the main objection against this sense of the word μαθητῆς and μαθητεύεσθαι in the case of infants, that they should be understood to be discipled to Christ by baptism before any actual teaching of them, is, that that word is seldom (the objectors say, never) used without including present actual teaching in its signification.

It is true that it is far oftener used in the case of such as do at that time learn, or have learned, or been taught: and so are all words like or parallel to it: as when we say, Such a master’s scholar, pupil, servant, apprentice, &c.; such a captain’s soldier, &c.; these words are far oftener used in the case of present learning, serving, bearing arms, &c., because there is oftener occasion to speak of them in that state. But yet it is truly and properly said of any lad, that he is such a man’s pupil or scholar, as soon as he is entered and consigned to learn of him, though he has not yet begun; such a master’s servant or apprentice, as soon as he is bound to him; though he does not yet practise or learn any part of his trade, or do any service: such a captain’s soldier, as soon as he is listed; though he does not yet bear arms.

In like manner the word μαθητῆς Χριστοῦ, ‘a disciple of Christ,’ is far oftener used in the case of such as have already begun to learn and practise his religion: because there is oftener occasion in books to speak of something which they do or say, or which happens to them during the time of their discipleship, than there is of that first act of their entering: but it may truly and properly be used concerning one that is now dedicated, consigned, agreed, and entered to

<sup>1</sup> [Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo, sect. 39. p. 136. edit. Benedict.]

learn and practise it, though he has not yet begun. And it is so used when there is occasion to speak of such a case.

If any one will diligently compare these three texts, Matt. x. 42; Mark ix. 41; Luke ix. 48; he will perceive these three terms—the *receiving any one as μαθητήν, a disciple*—and the *receiving him as τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντα, belonging to Christ*—and the *receiving him ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, in the name of Christ*—to be used by our Saviour as terms equivalent, signifying the same thing. And he will there see also a child so received by our Saviour himself.

As for the language of the Old Testament; a *child, or little one*, has the term given him of being *entered into a covenant*, Deut. xxix. 11, 12. Now in that language a *covenanter*, or *son of the covenant*; and a *proselyte*, and a *disciple*, do signify the same thing. An infant can for the present no more *covenant* than he can *learn*: yet he has the name of a *covenanter*, being entered into the covenant by his parents.

Beside the instance that I gave before of the phrase being ordinary in the Jews' language to call the infant child that was dedicated and baptized, a *proselyte*, though he was not yet capable of present learning, but only was consigned to learn, there is (as Dr. Lightfoot in his *Horæ Hebraicæ* quotes) in *Bab. Schabb.*<sup>r</sup> fol. 31, an apposite example of such a way of speaking: where one comes to Rabbi Hillel, and entreats him;

‘Fac me discipulum; ut me doceas.’ *Make me [or enter me] thy disciple; that thou mayest teach me.*

So that it was an usual acceptance of the word *proselyte*, or *disciple*, in the language which our Saviour spoke, and in which St. Matthew wrote.

It is said, Luke ix. 57, *It came to pass, as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.* Now St. Matthew calls this man, and another who offered himself at the same time, *disciples*. For he, chap. viii. 19, 20, 21, having recited the same that St. Luke does, concerning the first man, subjoins immediately; *Another of his disciples, ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, said unto him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father.* The latter is expressly called a *disciple* by St. Matthew; who calling him *another disciple*, does implicitly call the former likewise a *disciple*: though it seems to be the first meeting that the first had with our Saviour: and neither of them had gone any further than to express a purpose of following him.

<sup>r</sup> [Meaning the chapter of the Babylonian Talmud, entitled *Schabbath*.]



215.  
(A.D. 315.) Eusebius, in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, lib. iii. c. 5, brings an instance of one that makes a proposal, or sets up for a teacher of any art or science. "Ὁ τε γὰρ διδάσκων ἐπαγγελίαν μαθήματος τινος ἐπαγγέλλεται. Οἱ τε μαθηταὶ μαθημάτων ὀρεγόμενοι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς τῷ διδασκάλῳ προσφέροντες ἐπιτρέπουσιν. 'One gives out that he will teach some art. The disciples, being desirous of the skill, offer and commit themselves to the master.' They are here called *disciples* before they had begun to learn any thing; only they were appointed to learn.

In Numb. iii. 28, the Kohathites were set apart to be keepers of the charge of the sanctuary. The infants, as well as their fathers, have the title given them of *keepers* of that charge. For so are the words; *In the number of all the males, from a month old and upward, were eight thousand and six hundred, keeping the charge of the sanctuary.*

So little do grammatical derivations of words signify to limit the sense of them; which must rather be taken from the common use of them in the books and languages from whence they are quoted. *Μαθητὴς* is derived from *μανθάνω*, 'to learn.' Therefore, may a grammarian perhaps say, it cannot be applied but to one that does now actually learn. But we must rather see in what latitude St. Matthew (who, or whose interpreter, was, I think, the first that formed the derivative *μαθητεύω* from it in any active transitive signification) does use the word. And he uses it not only for present learners, but for some that were appointed to learn. The word has indeed always a reference to learning; but does not always suppose that learning to be at that present time, when any one is made or styled a disciple.

Another thing that causes in vulgar people a prejudice in understanding those words of our Saviour is this: A man that cannot read books is apt to form all his notions of things by what he sees in his own time and country. So an illiterate man (in England for example) hearing of the apostles being sent into the nations to disciple and baptize them, he imagines it like some preacher's coming into England, as it is now, to preach and baptize the people. Now this notion naturally creates in his mind a supposal that Christians did not baptize their children in infancy, because they are not now to be baptized after they are taught. He does not animadvert to that difference which appears by conceiving all those nations to which the apostles were sent, as heathens; who must be baptized after they were taught, having had no fathers to baptize them before. This indeed looks gross; but one may per-

ceive plain footsteps and traces of such conceptions among ignorant people in the tenor and chain of their discourse.

5. There has been an argument raised against infants' baptism, even from that text by which (among others) the Fathers did never fail to prove it. I mean, from those words of our Saviour, John iii. 5, which are in the English, *Except a man be born again of water, &c.* They catch hold of the word *man* there, and say, it is declared necessary for every one after he is a man grown. I would not have any antipædobaptist, that keeps a more refined conversation, think, that I feign or impose this on them. It is certainly true, that some ignorant people in country places do not only urge this, but do say that it is inculcated to them by their teachers.

I shall not stand to shew the mistake of this, having said more than so palpable a misunderstanding of the words, as they are in the original, can deserve, part i. ch. 6. § 13; part ii. ch. 6. § 1.

6. To enervate an argument taken out of Scripture for infant-baptism, is equivalent to the forming of one against it; and does as much tend to the excusing of any illiterate man, if the proofs which should have convinced him that children are to be baptized, be eluded either by translations that give an imperfect sense, or by false interpretations, the falsehood whereof he cannot perceive. I shall give three instances:

1. In that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, which is rendered in English, *Now are your children holy.* The word here translated *holy* is far more often in St. Paul's Epistles translated *saints*; and so almost all (not quite all) the ancients do understand St. Paul here, as if he had said in English, 'Now are your children *saints*.' They observe, moreover, that with St. Paul this term *saints* is generally used as another word for *Christians*. As, *To the saints at Ephesus, at Rome, &c.*, is as much as to say, *To the Christians there.* Therefore they take St. Paul to mean, 'Now are your children Christians;' that is to say, baptized. He persuades the believing wife not to go away, but to stay, in hopes that she may convert, or *save*, as he words it, her unbelieving husband; and that the rather, because it appeared that the grace of God did generally so far prevail against the infidelity of the other, that the children of such matches were baptized for the most part. This interpretation, or such as amounts to the like effect, I have shewn to be the most current among the primitive Christians, in those places of the collection which are referred to before, at No. 9, of the evidences for infant-baptism. And if it be allowed, there needs no more evidence for it from Scripture.

But what shall an unlearned man do, that meets with this text

expounded by new interpretations that do totally set aside that meaning; as *holy*, that is, not *bastards*, &c.?

Methinks this should be plain; that since the word *ἅγιοι* is sometimes translated *saints*, and sometimes *holy*, there should even at those places where it is translated *holy*, be understood such a holiness as is something agreeable to the signification of the word *saints*; and not a new-made signification, in which neither St. Paul nor any other apostle did ever use the word.

2. The words of that other text, John iii. 5, were always taken in one fixed and undoubted sense and meaning, viz. to signify baptism. And that so known and supposed, that not only the words at length, *born again of water*, &c., but the word *born again*, or *regenerate*, alone was used as another word for *baptized*, and *regeneration* for *baptism*, not only by all the Fathers of the first four hundred years, but, I think, for above one thousand years following. So here was a plain place of Scripture for baptizing of all persons that should enter the kingdom of God.

But even this has been in great measure defeated by a new interpretation, much of the nature of that by which the Quakers do elude all those places that speak of the other sacrament. For as they, by the words, *bread*, *wine*, *eating*, *drinking*, &c., do force themselves to mean some mystical or metaphorical thing: as for *bread*, something else, (*internal bread*, I think,) and so of the rest: so the new interpreters of this place do by the word *water* here. In short, they have brought it to this; that the text does not signify baptism at all, nor any thing about it. And the notion and signification of the words *regenerate* and *regeneration* is by degrees so altered in common speech, that he that reads them in any modern book does not know nor understand them again, when he meets with them in any ancient one. From whence proceeds the wondering that some have made at St. Austin, when reading occasionally some chapter of him, they have found that he takes all that are baptized to be regenerate: thinking he means by *regenerate* the same that they do, viz. converted in heart, &c.

But at this rate of altering the sense of words any text of Scripture whatever may be eluded. The most fundamental article of the New Testament—I believe in *Jesus Christ*. It is but to take the words *Jesus Christ* in a new sense for *the light within a man's self*; and then, if he believe in himself, he holds the article. Therefore the words of Scripture, or of any old book, must be taken in that sense in which they were current at that time. Which because it is a thing that vulgar people, of whom I speak, cannot inquire



into; therefore I put this way of evading the force of this text among the answers to it that may pass with them; but it appears vain to those that are acquainted with the old use of the word.

3. There is another interpretation yet, by which the force of that text is evaded. And that is by such as do grant indeed that the words *born again of water*, &c., are to be understood of baptism; but they say that by *the kingdom of God* there, is to be understood, not *the kingdom of glory hereafter in heaven*; but the church here, or the dispensation of the Messiah. So that it is as much as to say; Except any one be baptized, he cannot enter into, or be a member of, the church. I shew, part ii. ch. vi. § 1. No. 2, that this interpretation is plainly inconsistent with the context: and also that it avails not this cause, if it were allowed.

These last mentioned reasons, evidences, and arguments, though I think them not justly pleadable against infant-baptism, yet I thought it fair to set them down. Let every one pass his judgment. And if they have not any real weight in true arguing, yet the appearance of it which they carry does serve to make people pass the more favourable censure on those of the antipædobaptists, who have no means of understanding the history of the ancient times, and can read only the vulgar translations of Scripture, and do light only on such expositors as I have mentioned.

But this I must say; that any antipædobaptist, who having better means of knowledge is convinced that any of these arguments have really no force, and yet does urge them upon the more ignorant people, acts very disingenuously toward them, and is a prevaricator in the things of God. For to use any argument with an intent to deceive, hath in it (though there be no proposition in it that is false *in terminis*) the nature of a lie: which, as it is base and unmanly in human affairs, so it is impious when it is pretended to be for God; as Job says, ch. xiii. 7.

---

## CHAP. XI.

*A dissuasive from separation on account of the difference of opinion about the age or time of receiving baptism.*

I. WHAT I have to say in this last chapter, I have kept as a reserve: that in case people cannot be brought to be of one opinion in this question; yet they may avoid that which is nowadays made a common consequence of the difference in sentiments about it, and is far more dangerous to their souls' health, than the mistake itself

is; I mean, the renouncing of one another's communion in all other parts of the Christian worship. Whosoever could prevail on them to relinquish this humour of dividing, would do a most acceptable piece of service to the Christian religion and the salvation of their souls.

For our blessed Saviour, who does easily pardon involuntary errors and mistakes, and forbids his members to despise or reject one another for them, does impute a heavy guilt to those that go about to break or divide the unity of his body.

I had thought once to insert here a discourse of the great sin and mischief of schism: but having been too long already, and that being a subject which requires, and has had, just tracts written on it, I shall content myself with reciting briefly a few plain proofs of the stress which God in Scripture lays upon our *endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit* (i. e. a spiritual or religious unity, and not only living quietly near one another) *in the bond of peace*, notwithstanding differences in opinions.

1. There is no one thing that is oftener, nor so often, commanded, inculcated, entreated, and prayed for, by our Saviour and his apostles, than that all Christians should be one, and as members of the same body. And on the other side, no sin that is more severely forbidden, represented as more mischievous, nor more terribly threatened, than divisions, schisms, separations, and whatsoever breaks the said unity. St. Paul does not only reckon such things as undoubted signs of a carnal mind, 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4, but also, when he gives a roll or catalogue of the sins which are certainly damning, *which they that practise shall not inherit the kingdom of God*, Gal. v. 19, 20, 21, such as adultery, drunkenness, &c., he reckons among the rest *στάσεις καὶ αἰρέσεις*, which we render *seditions, heresies*, which are the names which he commonly gives to divisions. Since his time, indeed, the latter of those words has been used to denote false doctrines in the fundamentals of faith: but he never means any thing else by it, but parties, factions, sects, or divisions. One plain instance in what sense he takes it is in 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19, where what are called *divisions* in one verse are called *heresies* in the other. Let any one read this text for the meaning of the word: and then let him turn back again to Gal. v. 19, where adultery, murder, and heresies are declared subject to the same condemnation, of exclusion from God's kingdom.

The sinfulness of schism is so plainly, fully, and frequently set forth by our Saviour and his apostles, that there are no Christian writers or teachers of any church whatever, but what do, if they are

required to speak, own that it is in its nature a mortal sin; even the leaders of schismatical congregations dare not deny it. If they did, they would be convicted of denying plain Scripture. But as archbishop Tillotson does somewhere<sup>k</sup> observe of the popish preachers, that though they do own in their writings and disputes with the protestants, that repentance and amendment of life is necessary to the forgiveness of sins; yet in their discourses to their people they say so much of confession to a priest, &c., and so little of amendment of life, that the people think all of the one, and little of the other: so there are several teachers, who, among all the sins that they forewarn their people of, do so seldom preach against schism and division, so seldom quote those places of Scripture that set forth the guilt of it; and when they do, do touch that point so tenderly, that the people, if they do not trust their own eyes in reading God's word, and taking it all together, are apt to forget that schism is any sin at all: or at most, they conceive of it as of a little one. All the Christians near our Saviour's time had a quite contrary sentiment. They, when they gathered up into one short draught or creed the most fundamental and necessary truths that they were to hold, put in this for one; 'I believe the holy catholic church, and the communion of saints;' i. e. I own the universal church, and that all Christians in it ought to hold communion one with another. For the word *saints* is in Scripture and all other old Christian books used as another word for Christians: and 'the communion of saints' means nothing else in the Creed but the communion of Christians. He then that believes other things to be duties, and this to be none, ought, when he repeats the Creed, to say; I believe all the rest of it, but I do not own 'the communion of saints' as any article of Christian faith.

II. 2. Whereas the sinfulness of schism in general will not bear a dispute: but all people that separate do, if they be forced to speak, own, as I said, schism to be a great sin; but do say withal that their separation is not schism in the Scripture-sense, because the church, from which they have separated, is such, as from which one ought to separate: and whereas the reason that is usually given of the necessity of a separation of one from another, is, that one party holds tenets and opinions which the other cannot assent to, or administers some of the divine offices in such ways as the other does not approve; but takes the opinions to be errors, and the said administrations to be grounded on those errors: the thing to be

<sup>k</sup> [See his Sermon No. 108, on Job xxxiii. 27. printed in vol. ii. p. 29. of his Works, fol. London, 1714, &c.]



inquired is, whether these opinions, which are judged to be errors, be such as do overthrow the foundation of Christian faith. For if they be such, the plea must be allowed. False doctrines in the fundamentals of religion do put a bar to our communion with those that teach them.

But if they be not such, we have a plain direction and order from St. Paul to bear with one another, to receive one another to communion, notwithstanding differences in them, and not to judge or despise one another for them. He has a discourse purposely on this subject. It begins Rom. xiv. 1. He continues it through all that chapter, and to verse 8 of the next. He instances in men holding contrary sides in the disputes which troubled the church at that time. He both begins and ends that discourse with a positive command that they *receive one another* notwithstanding them; and he plainly means (as whoever reads the whole place will observe) to communion as brethren; and not only to live in peace and quietness with one another; which last they were to do with the heathens their neighbours.

He orders those of them that were positive, and sure that their opinion was the right, to content themselves with that *full persuasion of their own mind*, and to take it for granted that they are not bound to bring all the rest over to their opinion; nor yet to forsake their communion, if they will not so be brought, ver. 22: *Hast thou faith?* (*faith* here signifies that *full persuasion of mind* mentioned before at ver. 5,) *have it to thyself before God.* He would have them be so modest, as to think at the same time that others, as good as they, might yet continue of the other opinion.

He shews, ch. xv. ver. 5, 6, that they may, notwithstanding these differences, *with one mind and one mouth glorify God.* And whereas he prays there that they may be (as we translate it in English) *like-minded one toward another*; those phrases, of *like-minded*, and *one mind*, do not import that they that thus join in glorifying God must of necessity be all of one opinion in disputable matters; for it has been all along his scope to shew, that they might well enough do that, though each did keep his several opinion in those things. But those phrases denote only, that they should do it unanimously, (which is the proper rendering of the word *ὁμοθυμαδόν*, and that which St. Paul generally means by the word *αὐτὸ φρονεῖν*, as bishop Stillingfleet has shewn<sup>1</sup>, by instances. And they might be unanimous in glorifying God, though they were not all of a mind as to meats, days, &c., since in the main matters they were all of a mind.

<sup>1</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, part ii. sect. 19, 20. [p. 17. 163—175. 4<sup>o</sup>. Lond. 1682.]

And though St. Paul there do instance only in the disputes about meats, and drinks, and days, &c., yet the tenor of his discourse, and the reasons he gives against separating for them, do reach to all differences that are not fundamental. For that which he says, *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness*, &c., is applicable to any opinions that are not of the foundation: the kingdom of God, or substance of religion, does not consist in such things. And as he says, *For meat destroy not the work of God*; we may say of such opinions, do not for such things destroy that unity which Christ has made so essential to his church. But it is otherwise of the fundamental articles of our faith; for in them the kingdom of God does consist. If any one do hold, or practise idolatry, or the worship of any but the true God; or do deny the divinity of Christ, or his death for our sins, or the necessity of repentance and a good life, or the belief of the resurrection and judgment to come; the apostle would never have bid us receive such, or hold communion with them.

But there are, besides those that hold such doctrines, pernicious to the foundation, abundance of Christians that hold the same faith in all fundamental points, who do yet live in division and separation, disowning and renouncing one another's communion. It is pity but these should be reduced to the unity which Christ's body requires.

Now there is no other way in the world to effect this, but only that which the apostle here prescribes, viz. that they receive one another, notwithstanding the different opinions they may hold about lesser matters. There have other ways been tried, ways of human policy; but all with wretched success. They have been tried with so much obstinacy, as almost to ruin the church.

The church of Rome has tried to reduce all men to unity, by forcing them to be all of one opinion, and to submit their judgments to her dictates; some of which are things which the Scripture teaches not, and some directly contrary to it. They use to this purpose, first, disputations; and when that will not do, then fire and fagot, or other cruelties. We have lived to see what tyrannous, unchristian, and bloody work a neighbour prince has made<sup>m</sup> to bring all his subjects to be of one religion, (as he calls it,) that is, all of one opinion in all things delivered by that church; which has been far from limiting herself to fundamental articles. And we have seen the event; he has made some hypocrites and apostates, who do upon all occasions shew the regret of their conscience;

<sup>m</sup> [Alluding to the transactions in France, connected with the revocation of the edict of Nantes, &c.]

some refugees, and some martyrs. This way therefore of bringing people to glorifying God unanimously, by drawing up a set of particular opinions, and forcing all men to subscribe to them, is no successful way. It requires of men what God in Scripture never requires. It has filled the world with blood and enmity, and has made Christendom a shambles. St. Paul with all his apostolical authority does not, we see, require it; but says, in such things let each be fully persuaded in his own mind, (meaning, till one by reason do convince the other, or be convinced by him,) and in the mean time receive and own one another as brethren.

Another way that has been tried is quite on the contrary, and runs to the other extreme. It is this. They that are of different opinions in these lesser matters say thus; we will not *receive each other* at all, i. e. not to any Christian communion; and yet we will obtain the end that St. Paul would have, viz. the setting forth *the glory of God*, by another way as good. Since we are of this opinion and you of that, do you make one church of Christ, and we will make another: we will own no church-communion with you, nor you with us; we will neither receive you, nor desire to be received by you. And yet we will live in peace, and try which shall come to heaven soonest.

Now this is on the other side the most contrary to the nature and design of Christianity of any thing that could be devised. For Christ, as he is but one head, never designed to have any more but one body. Here we see already two, totally distinct, for they receive not one another. And observe the consequence of such a principle. They continue but a very little while, before that in each of these churches, some members differing from the rest in opinion about some new-started matter, make a subdivision, as necessary as the first division was. Then the church, which out of one became two, out of two is propagated to four; and by the same reason, and by following on the same principle, there will quickly be forty. Nay, it is certain, and will be plain to any one that considers, that by driving that principle home, of making separate churches, of all different opinions, it will come to pass at last, that there will not be any two men of one church. For if all things relating to religion were to be canvassed, there are not any two men in the world of the same mind in all things.

The fault therefore of this way is evident. They are in the right in supposing that there will always be variety of opinions; and that it is in vain to think by any force to prevent it. But to think that the number of churches must hold pace with the number of opinions,



is a mistake of wretched consequence. It makes Christ's church, which should be a compacted body, a rope of sand. It perpetuates for ever those strifes and janglings about opinions, which in one communion would quickly cease: for each party, when they have thus taken sides, will always strive to justify their own side. It is that which the ancient Christians call, 'the setting up altar against altar.' It gives so advantageous a handle to the common enemy, that he desires no other, to ruin any church that is so divided into parties. St. Paul well apprehended the consequence of such dividings, when he<sup>n</sup> besought the Corinthians by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that they would not admit of any such method: and when he entreated the Christians at Rome<sup>o</sup>, that if any one among them did go about such a practice, the effect should be, that every one of them should avoid him. In a word, where Christianity is in this state, it is in the next degree to dissolution.

And whereas the proposers or defenders of this course do say; we may live in peace, though we do renounce one another's communion in religion: this is neither practicable for any long time, nor is it sufficient for a Christian's purpose. Not practicable; for, as our Saviour has said, a house so divided cannot stand; so we see by experience the heartburnings, and hatred, and emulations, and bitter zeal, which the separate parties do always shew one against another. Not sufficient; because Christ requires that all his disciples should be as brethren, and as limbs of the same body, which is more than outward peace and quietness. The heathen neighbour cities that worshipped several gods, would sometimes make a league of peace, and say, Do you worship your God, and we will worship ours, without meddling with one another's religion: but it is horrible so to divide Christ.

It remains therefore that there is no other way to answer the design of Christ, than that Christians of the same faith do hold communion and receive one another, notwithstanding their various opinions. And if any one object against his joining with the established church where he lives, that he is of one opinion, and they of another in many things; he needs only to mind, that this is the very case that St. Paul was here speaking of, when he bids them *receive one another*. They that he speaks to, were likewise of different opinions; and it was on occasion of such difference that he gives them this command of not separating for them.

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. i. 10.

<sup>o</sup> Romans xvi. 17.

Before I go any further, I shall observe two corollaries that do naturally follow from what has been said.

One is, that in far the greatest number of the divided churches and parties that are in Christendom, the sin, the mischief, and the danger to their souls does not consist so much in the tenets and opinions for which they differ, as in the divisions which they make for them, the separations, the mutual excommunications, or renouncing of one another's communion. This I conceive to be so clear a truth, that whereas if I had a friend or brother, or any one for whose eternal good I were most concerned, that differed in some such opinions from the church where he lived, and, as I thought, from the truth; and yet did resolve and declare (as the old English puritans did) that he would make no disturbance or separation; I should think it a thing of no great consequence whether ever his opinion were rectified or not: yet, if I found that he were inclined to separate, I should think labour ought to be taken, as for his life, to hinder that.

The other is; that those churches which do impose, as terms of communion, (I mean of lay-communion,) the fewest subscriptions, or indeed none at all, to any doctrines, beside the fundamental doctrines of Christian faith; have in that respect the best and most excellent constitution. It is fitted for the fulfilling of this command of the apostle. To do otherwise, is to refuse what he here prescribes, of *receiving one that is weak in the faith*. For supposing those doctrines to be true, yet he may think otherwise; and then he cannot be received without affirming what is in his conscience a falsehood. He is therefore rejected; and as far as the church can go, lost. Whereas if he had been received without such a condition, he might either have learned better in time; or if he had not, that error would not finally have much hurt him, for it is supposed to be no fundamental one. Nor would it have hurt the church; for he is supposed to be one that desired to be received, and that would not have made any schism for it. I do not pretend to know the history of the constitutions of the many churches that now are; but of all that I do know, the church of England is in this respect the best constituted. That church requires of a layman no declaration, subscription, or profession, but only of the baptismal covenant. Any person, when he is baptized, must by himself, if he be of age, by his sponsors, if an infant, profess to renounce the Devil and all wickedness, to believe the Creed, and to keep God's commandments. There is nothing required after this to his full communion, save that he learn, and

answer to the questions of, a very short catechism; of one clause whereof I must by and by say something. Nobody can in other matters compel him to subscribe the opinions which the church thinks truest, nor to recant those which he thinks truest.

III. 3. The same that has been said of different opinions in doctrinal points, not fundamental, may be applied to the several ways of ordering the public worship, prayers, administration of the sacraments, &c. Of which ways it does as naturally fall out, that some do like one best, and some another; as it does of the foresaid different opinions, that some think one true, and some the other. The same rule for avoiding of schism must therefore be applied here as there: only with this difference; of those opinions, there was no necessity that the man, I spoke of, should be required to assent to such as the generality thought the truest; but here the nature of the thing requires, that if he hold communion, he must join in the prayers and other service. I must divide the difficulties that may arise upon this, into two cases.

One man does not apprehend any thing sinful, unlawful, or erroneous, in any of the prayers or service; but yet he likes some other ceremonies, orders, and ways of worship that are used in some other nations or churches, better than he does those of his own. And therefore he holds it lawful, and useful for spiritual advancement, to gather together a number of men of a like taste and relish with himself, and make a separate body by themselves.

This man has but a very little and slight sense of the sin of schism; scandalously little. Either he has not read what the Scripture says of it; or else dulness or prejudice has taken off the edge of his apprehension, so as that he felt nothing at the reading of those earnest and moving passages of our Saviour and the apostles on that subject. To confess the orders and service of a church to be lawful, and to join in them perhaps sometimes; and yet to foment the mischief of schism, under which all Christendom, especially the protestant religion, and particularly the state of religion in England and Holland, does now groan and gasp! and all this for a gust, a flavour, an humour, an itching ear pleased with this or that mode of preaching, praying, &c. To divide the body of Christ out of mere wantonness! What answer will such an one make at the last day, for having made so light of that on which the word of God has laid such a stress? St. Paul<sup>q</sup> entreats by *the consolation in Christ, by the comfort of love, by the fellowship of the Spirit, by all bowels and mercies*, that Christians should be unanimous: is it then a matter



of small moment to divide them into sides, parties, and several bodies?

That among various ceremonies, forms, and methods of ordering church matters one should like one best, and one another, is no new or strange thing at all; but ever was and ever will be. But yet in the primitive times, if any man or number of men went about upon that pretence to set up a separate party from the established church of that place, it made the Christians tremble to hear of such a thing. And all the neighbouring churches (for they then all kept a correspondence and communion with one another) did use to send notice of their abhorrence of such separatists, and renounce any communion with them during their schism; and never were at ease till they had restored unity. A practice which the pastors of the church of Geneva have lately in a generous and laudable way imitated in respect of our English separatists, though using in most things the same ceremonies that those of Geneva do. They had indeed various usages in the churches of several countries; but a Christian of Africa, if he came to Greece, complied with the Grecian ceremonies, though he might like his own better. Or, if it happened otherwise that he liked those of Greece better than his own, yet upon his return home he submitted to the rules and customs of his own church, and did not set up a new sect out of a pride that he had learned a better way. If he thought it was better, or if it really were so, yet to make a separation for it did ten times more mischief than that amendment could recompense. If there be any usage or order in a church which may be altered for the better, for any man in his station to do his endeavour that this may be done by common vote and consent, was ever accounted laudable. And where the corruption is got into the vitals of religion, it is true that it must be done by a separation, rather than not at all. But in other cases, where it is not a gangrene, he that goes about to cure the body by tearing it limb from limb, is himself the most dangerously infected member, and ought to be first cut off, by St. Paul's direction<sup>r</sup>, if he had any skill. As we say of sermons, that must be an excellent one indeed, in which there is nothing that might have been said better; and yet that must be a sorry one indeed, out of which one may not receive some wholesome direction; or of cities, there is hardly any whose laws and government are not capable of amendment in some things; and yet very few so ill-governed, where an industrious and peaceable man may not enjoy so much quiet as to get a livelihood by his diligence: so that must be a pure church indeed, whose orders and

<sup>r</sup> Rom. xvi. 17.

rules have no fault or imperfection at all; and yet that must be a woful church, with which a good Christian may not communicate; or under whose doctrine and discipline he may not by a godly diligence work out his salvation. Of the first sort there is none in the world. And, as I hope, no protestant national church of the latter sort; none, I mean, with which a good Christian may not communicate, provided they will admit him without requiring his declared assent to all their tenets. For errors they may have, and some of them hold some opinions contrary to what others do; yet since none of these do overthrow the foundation of Christian faith, neither do they mix any idolatry in their worship. If any party of the members of any of these churches (the church of Denmark for example) should in opposition to the general body of the church there, say, "We like the ways and methods of some other church (the church of England for example) better;" and should thereupon make a schism from their fellow-members, it would be a sinful one. And it is no other in ours here that do the like. The church of England do declare thus concerning the rites and ceremonies which they have ordered: 'In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe any thing but to our own people only. For we think it convenient, that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, &c., and that they should put away other things which from time to time they perceive to be most abused; as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversely in divers countries.' They say moreover; 'Although the keeping or omitting of a ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing; yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God.' This plainly shews that they would not approve of a schism that should be set up in any other church, though it were for the introducing of those ways of worship which they have prescribed. And many of the chieftest men of other protestant churches have made the like declaration on their side. This is the ancient way of a catholic correspondence and unity between the churches. They do all judge thus; that in those various ways of all managing the public worship, though one may think one the best, and another another, yet that the worst of them with unity is better than the best without it.

This may be explained by a comparison taken from temporal af-

<sup>s</sup> Preface to the Book of Common Prayer. [Of ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained.]

airs. There are in several nations several forms of state government; one is ruled by monarchy, another by a senate, others by more popular ways. It is common for men of reading, or travel, or conversation, to discourse of these ways. One likes one best, and another another. And so far there is no harm done; because each of them resolves as yet, that whichsoever he likes best, he will live quietly under that where he is placed. But if one of these who lives under either of these forms do go about to draw a party after him, and says, "We will live no longer under this form of government; we know a better way, and we will set up that;" he is now turned a traitor, and must be suppressed by the policy of any government whatsoever.

Or in an army; if the question be, whether it be best to march this way against the enemy, or that way, or lie still; each one in the council is free to give his opinion. And it may be, that he whose counsel is not approved by the majority, gives advice which is really the better. Yet if the resolution be once taken, and the general lead out accordingly one way; if any officers go about to draw a part of the army after them, and say, "We will march the other way," they are now mutineers and public enemies, how good soever their advice were. Because either of the ways with the union of the army is better than the dividing of it: that brings certain ruin and confusion.

The Scripture and experience too do shew that the case is the same in reference to a church. Only as in the army, if the soldiers do understand by any plain and certain discovery that the general officers are traitors, and have agreed to betray their prince's cause, a revolt from them is in such case fidelity to their sovereign: so if a church do bring into their worship plain idolatry, or into their doctrines such positions as destroy the foundation of Christian faith or godliness; this is treason against our chief Lord, and justifies separation from such a church. But in the case now put, of a man that allows the established way of worship to be lawful, but pretends to set up a better, and thinks a separation justifiable on that account; such a man is so far from being fit to be a leader or amender of a church, that he needs a catechism to teach him the first Christian principles of humility and modesty. Modesty would teach him to think, that if he judge one way the best, another as wise as he will be for another way, and a third party for another, &c. But God is a God of order, and not of such confusions.

What I quoted just now of the declaration of the church of England in respect to foreign churches, does visibly shew the mis-



take of those that argue that we cannot count those among us that separate schismatics; but that we shall by so doing condemn those foreign protestant churches, which differ from us in some of the same ceremonies as the dissenters at home do, of schism likewise. God forbid we should do that. It is not the use or disuse of this or that ceremony, order, &c., but it is the renouncing of communion for such use or disuse, that constitutes a schismatic. Now we and the foreign protestant churches do not do that. For one of us, whom providence should bring into their nation, would communicate with them, though their ceremonies and ways of worship are not altogether the same as ours; and they, when they come hither, do the same with us. And such churches, or such Christians, that are always ready to do so, have always a communion one with another in heart, in purpose, in inclination and acknowledgment; which they are ready to bring into act by corporal presence and joining, when providence makes it practicable. And this is, or ought to be, the temper between all churches that differ not in essentials. Now this is the only sense in which that saying is true; ‘That there is ‘no schism, where the differences are not in the fundamentals of ‘religion;’ i.e. Any two churches of different nations are always supposed to be in communion, and not in a schism, so long as they differ not in fundamentals; because it is supposed that the members of one of these would (in case they were to travel into the other nation) for unity’s sake communicate with those other.

But when people of the same place, city, parish, &c., do actually separate, and renounce communion with the church when they are on the spot; this plea cannot be used in their case. To say, these are not schismatics, because they differ not in fundamentals, is to put a new meaning on the word *schism*. They are not heretics indeed, as the church-use has now distinguished the use of those words. But the Donatists, Novatians, &c., have been always counted schismatics, though they differed not in essentials.

Those that differ from any true church in essentials, and do separate or are excommunicated for such difference, are, in respect of their opinions, more faulty than those we have been speaking of. But those that separate for smaller matters, are, in respect of the mere schism or separation, (if we could abstract that from the fault of the opinion,) the more faulty of the two. For the smaller the difference is, the greater fault and shame it is to make a breach for it: and though the other be, in the main, the greater sin, yet these are more plainly self-condemned.

IV. 4. The other difficulty that I proposed to speak of is some-

thing greater. There is a man that thinks the church holds some errors; not fundamental ones indeed; but she has brought these errors into her public service, in which he should join. He would not renounce a church for holding those errors in disputable points; but he cannot join in prayers to God which are grounded on, and do suppose a doctrine which he judges to be a false or mistaken one.

But, 1. The man acknowledges that this is not in matters fundamental.

2. He acknowledges that the main body of the prayers and service is such as all Christians agree to be necessary, and in which he may join with his mouth and understanding also.

Suppose then that there be some particular collects or prayers, or clauses of prayers, which he thinks to contain a mistake in them. May he not join with his brethren in the main, and omit the adding of his *Amen* to those particular clauses? Especially since no man requires of him to declare his approbation of the whole and every part? Is not this more Christian-like, than to fly to that dreadful extremity of separation, and total disowning, for a disputable point, which may possibly be his own mistake? And if the truth of the matter be that it is his own mistake; is there any likelier way to come to the knowledge of the truth, than by continuing in the body of the church, where the members, the faithful Christians, do by mutual edification help one another? Is not this the very council of St. Paul, Phil. iii. 15, 16. *And if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, [or however that be,] whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing?* This last clause [*let us mind the same thing*] is in the sense of the original, *let us be unanimous*; as bishop Stillingfleet<sup>t</sup> has shewn; and he has at the same place largely shewn, that this advice of the apostle is intended for this very purpose to which I have here applied it; namely, that such a man as we are here speaking of, should continue in communion, and conform to all that he can, and omit the saying *Amen* to what he judges a mistake. He confirms this interpretation with so good reasons; and his antagonist there opposes it with so weak ones, that it tempts one to think that he would not have opposed it at all, had it not been for fear that by this course the world would in a short time have lost the happiness of having any separate sects. If the reader will please to consult that book, he will have no further need of any arguments against separation.

<sup>t</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, part ii. sect. 19.

Some learned protestants (Melanethon, Calvin, Bucer, Peter Martyr, and others of the first reformers) have thought that in cases of necessity a protestant might join even in popish assemblies in those prayers that are sound; provided he did, to avoid scandal, protest against their superstitious ones. But I will not meddle with that.

The argument that some make for separation, because there are many ill men in the church, has been so plainly answered, that nothing more need be said. Whoever reads St. Paul's Epistles will find there were many scandalous members in all those churches, especially at Corinth, 1 Cor. v; 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21; and yet he will find that St. Paul, so far from advising the purer sort to separate from the church, does earnestly forbid any such practice, 1 Cor. i. 10; item xi. 18, &c.

V. 4. When a lawgiver names some particular exceptions of cases in which the law shall not oblige; that law binds the stronger in all other cases not excepted. For it is supposed, if there had been any more, he would have named them too. The Scripture gives a very positive law against separations. It excepts some cases. It is a very presumptuous thing to add any more to them of our own heads. They are these:

1. If a church do practise idolatry. St. Paul, warning the Corinthians of the heathen idolaters, says, *Come out from among them, and be ye separate*, 2 Cor. vi. 17. Though the popish idolatry be not so rank as that of those heathens, yet the general words do seem to reach their case. But the ignorant people among many sects of separatists, finding here the word *separate*, do indiscriminately apply it to justify separation from Christians against whom they do not in the least pretend any accusation of idolatry.

2. If a church teach doctrines encouraging any wickedness, as fornication, &c., or destructive of the fundamentals of the Christian faith. St. Paul mentions some, 2 Tim. ii. 18, that denied the resurrection and judgment to come. He commands Timothy to shun them; *for their word will eat as doth a canker*.

3. The Scripture commands that no sin be committed to obtain any purpose never so good. Therefore a church that will not admit us without our doing a thing that is wicked, or declaring and subscribing something that is false, does thereby thrust us out of her communion. And the guilt of the sin of separation lies at her door.

4. If a church be schismatical, i. e. in a state of unjustifiable division or separation from another church from which she has



withdrawn herself. St. Paul commands, Rom. xvi. 17, *Mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.*

These exceptions I find in Scripture: and I know of no more that reach to churches (particular men that live wickedly are to be avoided in our conversation, we know). He that separates from any church upon any ground except one of these four, ought to take heed and be well assured that he find his ground in the Scripture.

VI. Now to apply what has been said to the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists: the main inquiry is, whether the point in debate between them be a fundamental article of the Christian faith; for if it be, they must indeed separate in their communion, and the guilt will lie on those that are in the error. But if it be not, there is not by the rules laid down any sufficient reason for their separating or renouncing one another, which party soever be in the wrong.

Now I think that such a question about the age or time of one's receiving baptism does not look like a fundamental, nor is so reputed in the general sense of Christians. And there are these reasons why it should not be so accounted.

I. It is a general rule, that all fundamental points are in Scripture so plainly and clearly delivered, that any man of tolerable sincerity cannot but perceive the meaning of the holy writers to be, that we should believe them. Now baptism itself, viz. that all that enter into Christ's church should be baptized, is indeed plainly delivered in Scripture: so that we are amazed at the Quakers and Socinians; the one for refusing it, the other for counting it indifferent. But at what age the children of Christians should be baptized, whether in infancy or to stay till the age of reason, is not so clearly delivered, but that it admits of a dispute that has considerable perplexities in it: I mean with those that know not the history of the Scripture-times, nor the force of some of the original words in Scripture used. There is, as I have said, no plain example or instance of the baptism of any one that had been born of Christian parents set down at all either as received by him at full age, or received in infancy: which would have been the surest guide to us. None I mean, that is plain to vulgar readers of the English translation of Scripture: for that many of the Fathers did take 1 Cor. vii. 14. for a plain instance, I shewed before. And for the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, and our Saviour's rule, John iii. 5, whether they are to be understood to include infants and all, or only adult persons, is not so plain to the said readers as fundamental points use to

be. God's providence does not suffer, that the understanding of those places, upon the belief of which the salvation of all, even the meanest and most ignorant Christian does depend, (and such are the fundamental articles,) should require much skill, learning, or sagacity; but only an honest purpose and desire to learn. This therefore being not set down so very plain, does not seem by Scripture to be such a fundamental, as that we should be bound to renounce communion with every one that is not of the same opinion as we are about it.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. vi. 1, 2, speaking of some things which are styled 'principles of the oracles of God,' reckons amongst them the 'doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands.' Now whether the meaning of that place be to reckon both these, as things that must be believed and owned by all that shall be saved, is a question that needs not be discussed here. For suppose it be; both these parties do own baptism: they differ only about the time or manner of receiving it.

2. The ancient and primitive Christians for certain did not reckon this point among the fundamental ones. For they drew up short draughts and summaries of the faith, which we call creeds; and into these they put all those articles which they thought fundamental, or absolutely necessary. Now though some churches had their creeds a little larger than others; and some councils or meetings of Christians did overdo, in putting some opinions, which they valued more than need was, into their creeds; yet there never was any creed at all that had this article in it; either 'that infants are 'to be baptized:' or, that 'only adult persons are to be baptized.'

Baptism itself does indeed make an article in several old creeds.  
281. As for example, in the Constantinopolitan, which is now  
(A.D. 381.) received in all Christendom; 'I acknowledge one baptism  
 'for the remission of sins.' But the determination of the age or  
 manner of receiving it was never thought fit to make an article of  
 faith.

3. As for particular men among the ancients, there is, I know,  
100. none whom the antipædobaptists would so willingly hear  
(A.D. 200.) speak as Tertullian. He has a book about baptism, wherein  
 he first speaks of the matter, water; and of the form of baptism:  
 and then says, ch. 10, 'Having now discoursed of all things that  
 'make up the religion [or essence] of baptism, I will proceed to  
 'speak *de quæstiunculis quibusdam*, of some questions of small mo-  
 'ment;' and it is among those *quæstiunculæ* that he treats con-

cerning the age of receiving it. I recited the place at large, part i. ch. 4. § 2, &c.

100. 4. As Tertullian thought it a question of lesser moment, (A.D. 200.) so it seems the Christians of that time and place did not reckon it of so great moment as to break communion. For when he expressed his opinion to be against the practice then used of baptizing infants ordinarily, yet we do not find that he was excommunicated for that; nor at all, till he excommunicated himself by running away to the sect of the Montanists, who were indeed for their impious opinions abhorred of all Christians. Whereas if it had been accounted a fundamental article of faith, he could not have been borne with in his denial of it.

230. 5. This is yet more clear in the case of Gregory the (A.D. 330.) father of Gregory Nazianzen, who (if I computed right at part i. ch. 11. § 6, of which I do since that time make a question for the reasons given in this third edition) had some children born to him after he was in priest's orders, whom he brought up with him in the house without baptizing them; and they were not baptized till their adult age. And yet the man continued priest, and afterward bishop of that place till he died, being nigh one hundred years old. This for the sense of the ancient church.

6. For the sense of modern Christians: first the papists of modern times do confidently maintain, that there is no proof at all (direct or consequential) from the Scripture for infant-baptism. And it is certain, they do not pretend that there is any against it; for their church as well as others does practise it: and though their church can do well enough without Scripture, yet they would not have her convicted of going contrary to it. It follows then from their pretence, that the Scripture is silent in the case. If so, then it is a thing that no protestant will account a fundamental, and consequently will not divide for it. So these men's arguments will make us all friends; at least so far as to live in communion with one another. The worse would be, that if we did so, we should lose all those fine arguments against infant-baptism that come out in popish books every year. For they, seeing us united, would not count it worth their while; and they would then be as well content that there should be proof in Scripture for infant-baptism, as not.

But to leave these men, and to speak of such as are serious in religion: the most serious and judicious, both of the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists, (even those of them that have been most engaged against each other in polemical writings, which do com-



monly abate people's charity,) do agree that this difference is not in the essentials of religion. Here I might (if I had not been too long already) recite the words of bishop Taylor, Dr. Hammond, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Wills, &c., on the one side; and of Mr. Tombes, Mr. Stennet, &c., on the other. Mr. Stennet, in a book come out the other day, says<sup>u</sup>; 'If he [Mr. Russen] mean————that they [the 'antipædobaptists'] cannot look upon those that differ from them 'as Christians,————the contrary is well known.' And again, 'Enough has been said before, to take off the second reproach 'which he [Mr. Russen] casts on them [the antipædobaptists], viz. 'that they judge none of the true church, but those of their own 'way.' But it is better to quote their confessions. In the first year of king William, one party of the antipædobaptists [the *particular* men] published a Confession of their Faith: they say, it is the same for substance with that published 1643, in the name of seven churches, which I suppose were the first in England. Now they say, they are concerned for 'above a hundred.' They declare in the preface the design both of that and this confession to be, 'to manifest their consent with both [the presbyterians and independents] 'in all the fundamental articles of the Christian religion;' and, as they add afterwards, with other protestants. It is plain then, that they count not the age or manner of receiving baptism to be a fundamental.

And here, forasmuch as this confession is but lately come to my hands, I ought to do that justice to these men, as to own that they do for their part disclaim several of those opinions which I, at ch. viii. § 6, said were held by some of the English antipædobaptists. For besides that they give a full and catholic confession of the doctrines of the holy Trinity, ch. 2; of Christ's divinity and consubstantiality, ch. 8; and of his satisfaction, ch. 8 and 11; the denial of which points is not charged on any church of antipædobaptists: but only that some Socinians intrude among them, as they do every where:—besides these, they own original sin, ch. 6: oaths imposed by authority to be lawful, ch. 23: the Lord's day to be the day for Christian worship, and the Saturday sabbath to be abolished, ch. 22: that every church has from Christ all that power that is needful for carrying on order in worship and discipline, ch. 26: all bishops or elders, and deacons, to be ordained by imposition of hands, *ibid.*: all pastors to have a comfortable supply from the church, so as they need not be entangled in secular affairs; but may live of the Gospel, the people communicating to them of all their good things,

<sup>u</sup> Answer to Mr. Russen, ch. ii. p. 23; ch. x. p. 215. [It was published in 1704.]

ibid.: no member of a church ought to separate upon account of any offence [or scandal] taken at any of their fellow members, but to wait upon Christ in the further proceeding of the church, ibid.: in the Lord's Supper the minister to give the bread and wine to the communicants, ch. 30; so it seems these do not hand it about among themselves, as is said of some of them: worthy receivers do by faith 'really and indeed,' yet not carnally and corporeally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, ibid.: souls do not die nor sleep; but at a man's death are either received into glory, or cast into hell, reserved to the judgment, ch. 31: civil magistrates to be obeyed for conscience sake, ch. 24; but I cannot say how they reconcile this with what they say, ch. 21, that to obey out of conscience any human commands not contained in God's word is to betray true liberty of conscience. This needs a little explication.

Moreover, what is to our present purpose, they say; 'That all persons throughout the world, professing the faith of the Gospel, and obedience to God by Christ according unto it, not destroying their own profession by any errors everting the foundation, or unholiness of conversation, are and may be called, visible saints,' ch. 26. And they say afterward, ch. 27, 'That all these saints are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God.' Of which communion they say a little after, that 'as God offers opportunity, it is to be extended to all the household of faith; even all those who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.'

This laid together makes full to the purpose I am speaking of: every one ought to continue in the communion of a church that has no errors which do evert the foundation. And an error, or supposed error, about the age or manner of receiving baptism does not do that, by their own confession.

And now in the first year<sup>x</sup> of her present majesty, is published a draught of articles by some antipædobaptists, (the same I guess,) 'to manifest their nearness in union with other of her majesty's protestant subjects.' There are thirty-six of them. They are verbatim (except two or three clauses of no moment) the same with thirty-six of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; save that in the articles of baptism they leave out the last clause about infants' baptism. They come near to that subscription that is required to capacitate one for orders in that church: one would

<sup>x</sup> [Namely, 1702. I have not been able to meet with this publication.]

think then it should not be difficult to accomodate the matter of lay-communion.

What has been said does in the whole amount to this: that putting the case that there were in any nation a number of believers in Christ, who were not yet settled in any form of church-government, and did besides differ in some opinions not fundamental; and among the rest, in this question about infants' baptism; their duty would be, to unite themselves into one body or church, and not separate into parties and several churches for that difference. And if it be asked, how they should regulate the order for public worship in which they were all to join; and particularly whether they should allow an infant brought by its parents to the church for baptism, to be there baptized, or not allow it; there is no other way in such a case, than after a debate by arguments from Scripture and reason, to suffer themselves to be all determined by the major vote, which major vote must fix the rules of the national church there to be settled: and the minor part, who would have had some things to have been otherwise ordered, must comply with their brethren, and join in all things that they can, and by no means make a division. If the premises that have been laid down be looked upon as proved, they do certainly enforce this conclusion.

For any man to say in this case, the Scripture, and not the major vote, should determine, is frivolous. Because it is presupposed in the case, that it is about the meaning of Scripture, and about the force of the consequences and arguments drawn from Scripture, that they differ; and the Scripture itself directs them, that in such differences not fundamental, they should close and unite as well as they can, and bear with one another.

Now to apply this to the state of religion as it is now, when there are in all places national churches already settled, one ought, in order to lay the balance even between the pædobaptists and anti-pædobaptists, to suppose or imagine a thing that is not, but may easily be supposed; and that is, that there were some national church or churches of anti-pædobaptists in the world. And suppose a number of Christians, pædobaptists in their opinion, were by providence brought to live in one of those places; the question is, whether they ought to join in communion with the church of anti-pædobaptists there established, or make a separate body renouncing communion with them. I think it follows, from the rules of Scripture that have been laid down, that they ought to join with them. And I do not stick to declare, that if I were one of those new comers, I would do it, for one. So that I advise them to nothing in



respect to their joining the church here, but what I think were to be done by us if we were in their case. I mean, I would do thus ; since my opinion is, that infants ought to be baptized, I would get my own children baptized by all means possible ; but when that were done, I would nevertheless continue to join in public prayers, hearing, receiving the communion, &c., with them, if they would admit me ; if they rejected me for my opinion, the guilt of that breach would lie on them, and not on me. It is not an antipædobaptist or other dissenter in opinion that one is not to communicate with : it is a schismatic or divider that one is not to communicate with. And whereas some pædobaptist will say to me ; ‘ You seem ‘ by this putting of the case to make the opinions equal ; theirs to ‘ be as good as ours : and that it is only by the majority that we ‘ have the advantage :’ I do not so ; but this I say, the difference is not in fundamentals. And therefore, if thou be strong, and they be weak ; thou wise, and they foolish ; thy opinion rational, theirs silly ; yet we are still (or ought to be, for all the difference of opinions) members of the same body, and brethren. Men are not to be cut off for mistaken opinions that are consistent with true faith. Indeed if they will cut off themselves, there is no help for that. When a church loses its members, and they part from her as limbs from a body, there is that to be said which is commonly said of a husband and wife parting : there is certainly a great fault somewhere ; but there is commonly some fault on both sides.

Now to lay aside supposals, and to take the state of religion as it is now in the world : there is no national church in the world (and I think never was) but what are pædobaptists. All that are of the other way are such as have within the last two centuries made a separation from the established churches of the places where they are : as I made appear, ch. viii. The reasons that I have laid down from Scripture do require that they should return to unity of communion in those things wherein all Christians are agreed : and they may continue to argue in a charitable way about the opinion till one side be satisfied, or till they are weary. This is the best way to save their souls, whatever become of the opinion.

To speak of the case of England in particular. They know themselves that it is a separation begun less than eighty years ago, as I shew at ch. viii. § 6. Any very ancient man may remember when there was no Englishmen, or at least no society or church of them, of that persuasion. They at first held the opinion without separating for it. Their eldest separate churches are not yet of the age of a man, viz. seventy years. I mean the ancient men or men of read-

ing among them know this ; the young and vulgar, who will talk right or wrong for a side, do not own it ; but the others own it, and they justify it by pleading that their opinion is the truest : which plea, supposing it to be true, will not, in a conscience that is guided by God's word, justify a separation.

Let us put the case of an antipædobaptist, or other dissenter, that is never so sure that he is in the right, and that the church's opinion is absurd, inconvenient, foolish, &c., or any thing that he pleases to call it, so he do not call it idolatry, or heresy, or 'an error which does evert the foundation.' And yet, by their own principles before laid down, communion is to be continued. Let the man, when he is got into one of his severest fits of judging his brethren of the church, imagine them speaking to him, in the words of St. Paul to some Christians at Corinth, who were the most conceited and dividing people that he ever had to do with : *Ye are full, ye are rich. We are fools for Christ's sake, but ye are wise in Christ : we are weak, but ye are strong : ye are honourable, but we are despised. Yet receive us ; do not reject our communion in all things because we err in some things. Or, as he says in another place, If you think me a fool, yet as a fool receive me.*

There are several good books written purposely on this subject, and directed to the antipædobaptists, to shew that, supposing their opinion to be true, yet their schism is a sin : and that by men of both the opinions. One that is not rash, but desires to guide his conscience warily, will at least read and weigh what they say. Mr. Tombes, who continued an antipædobaptist to his dying day, yet as I am told<sup>z</sup> wrote against separation for it ; and for communion with the parish churches. I have not seen that book ; but this I have seen<sup>a</sup>, that where he defends his opinion against Marshal, and where Marshal had said, 'The teachers of this opinion, wherever they prevail, take their proselytes wholly off from the ministry of the word and sacraments, and all other acts of Christian communion both public and private, from any but those that are of their own opinion.' To this Tombes answers ; 'This is indeed a wicked practice, justly to be abhorred : the making of sects upon difference of opinion, reviling, separating from their teachers and brethren otherwise faithful, because there is not the same opinion in disputable points, or in clear truths not fundamental, is a thing too frequent in all sorts of dogmatists, &c. I look upon it as one

<sup>y</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 8, 10 ; 2 Cor. vii. 2. it. xi. 17.

&c. 8<sup>o</sup>. 1676.]

<sup>z</sup> Baxter, Reply to Hutchinson, [i. e. Review of the State of Christian Infants,

<sup>a</sup> Tombes's Examen of Marshal's Sermon, p. 31.

‘ of the great plagues of Christianity. You shall have me join with  
 ‘ you in shewing my detestation of it. Yet nevertheless, first it is to  
 ‘ be considered that this is not the evil of antipædobaptism, (you con-  
 ‘ fess some are otherwise minded,) and therefore must be charged on  
 ‘ the persons, not on the assertion itself. And about this, what they  
 ‘ hold, you may have now [the] best satisfaction from the Con-  
 ‘ fession of Faith in the Name of Seven Churches of them, Art. 33.  
 ‘ &c.’ And accordingly Mr. Tombes himself continued in com-  
 munion with the church till he died.

Mr. Baxter, who has wrote more books than any man in Eng-  
 land against the opinion, yet has also wrote more against the divid-  
 ing for it, and has made many wishes and proposals for accommoda-  
 tions of both sides joining in public communion ; especially in his  
 latter books, and in the history of his own life, when he had lived to  
 see the great mischief that schisms do to religion and all piety. I  
 will mention only one passage, wherein he recommends to the anti-  
 pædobaptists two books, useful to give them a true state of the  
 question about the unlawfulness of separation. ‘ I am,’ says he<sup>b</sup>,  
 ‘ not half so zealous to turn men from the opinion of anabaptistry,  
 ‘ as I am to persuade both them and others that it is their duty to  
 ‘ live together with mutual forbearance, in love and church-com-  
 ‘ munion, notwithstanding such differences: for which they may  
 ‘ see more reasons given, by one that was once of their mind and  
 ‘ way, (Mr. William Allen, in his Retraction of Separation, and  
 ‘ his Persuasive to Unity,) than any of them can soundly refel,  
 ‘ though they may too easily reject them.’ But then Mr. Baxter  
 gives there a marginal note, telling the antipædobaptists, ‘ Satan  
 ‘ will not consent that you should soberly read the books.’ Now  
 methinks an antipædobaptist that is desirous to direct his con-  
 science aright in so weighty a matter as separation is, should not  
 let Satan have his will altogether ; but should read such books, and  
 consider them at least, whether Satan will consent or not.

This I will own, in excuse of the English antipædobaptists that  
 do so divide, that it is a harder thing to repent of the sin of schism  
 in England than it is any where else. For the commonness of any  
 sin does in unthinking minds wonderfully abate the sense of the  
 guilt of it. When drunkenness is grown common, and almost  
 universal, one can hardly persuade an ordinary man that it is a  
 thing that will bring damnation on his soul ; because he sees almost  
 all the neighbourhood, and among them such a gentleman, or such

<sup>b</sup> Confutation of Forgeries of H. D. sect. 2. c. 2. § 13. [in his ‘ More Proofs of In-  
 ‘ fants’ church-membership,’ &c. 8<sup>o</sup>. 1675. page 221.]



a lord, as much concerned in that as he. So an antipædobaptist thinks, Whatever my opinion be, the separation for it can be no great fault; for the presbyterians, and other parties of men, do that as well as we, and for lesser differences. If we have taken those opinions which our ancestors held without separating, and have made a separate religion out of them, it is but what the others did before us: for they have taken the opinions which the old puritans had, and (though the puritans could not) yet they have made good Brownism out of them. And so for other parties. Now this humour of dividing is nowhere in the world so common as it is in England, (at least if we except the country I spoke of before,) nor the sin of schism so little feared, I mean of late years. The reason why the same texts of Scripture against schism, division, heresy, &c., being read by the protestants of other nations, do create in their minds a horror of it, but being read by an Englishman, do lose their force with him, is, because he has been born and bred in a nation where that is so common, and practised by men that are in other things so conscientious, that he is apt to put any forced sense on the words, rather than think that that text of St. Paul, for example, Rom. xvi. 17, is to be taken as the words sound; though there is (if a man desire plain Scripture) not a plainer text in the whole Bible. But the word of God and his law is not like human laws, that it should lose its edge by the multitude of offenders. God will not punish any sin less, I doubt he will punish it more, for having been a common or reigning one.

Some people also have so slightly considered the commands of God, that they think nothing to be a sin but what they see punished by the secular laws. And so because some Christian nations (whereof England does of late make one) have thought fit to grant an impunity to schismatics for some reasons of state, and to tolerate (though not approve of) churches or societies renouncing communion with the established church of the place, they are apt to think that God also does allow of the same, which will be true when God in his judgment will think fit to regulate himself by statute laws. But till that be, it is certain by God's word that either such a church, or else those that renounce her communion, are schismatics: either the one for giving just causes to the others to separate from her; or else the others for separating without just cause. It is certain also, that if any church should so far comply with reasons of state or human laws, as to teach, that schism (however by them tolerated) is not sin before God; this very doctrine would indeed be a good reason for any pious Christian to separate

from her: and that, by the second of the exceptions I gave just now. So gross is that notion, to think that separation is therefore no sin, because men's laws may at some times forbear to inflict any temporal punishment on it. But yet, as gross as it is, it is made to serve for an excuse to the consciences of many ignorant people. Partly this reason, and partly the commonness of the sin, have made, that many men's consciences do no longer accuse them for it.

VII. There may need a few words also concerning the difficulties that do lie in the way of the union that I have here proposed. They are none of them such, but what may, I hope, be accommodated, if the parties be willing. Some of them do lie on the part of the church in receiving these men: and some on the part of the men themselves, in respect of their acceptance of the communion offered them. I know of but two on each part.

On the church's part, one concerns the bishop of the diocese chiefly: the other, both the bishop and the curate of the parish. In speaking of which, the nature of the thing shews that I ought to submit what I shall say to the judgment of the parties concerned: which I declare that I do unfeignedly. I will only propose the question, leaving the determination to them.

I. Suppose a man do understand the nature and necessity of the church-union I have been speaking of; and accordingly does desire to continue, or to be, a member of the established church: but he is not satisfied of the validity or sufficiency of baptism given in infancy, or of baptism given by sprinkling or pouring of water on the face only; and therefore he (though perhaps baptized in infancy, yet) has procured himself to be baptized anew: and besides, he cannot consent to bring his children, if he have any, to be baptized in infancy; but reserves them to adult baptism: but in other things he is willing to be conformable to the rules of the church, and very desirous of the communion thereof. This man is, I suppose, by the rules of the Church of England, liable to be presented for his fault, both in receiving a second baptism, (for so it is in the esteem of the Church,) and in not bringing his children to baptism.

Here is one evasion, or salvo, which I scorn to make use of, as being not satisfactory to myself: viz. that the Church's hands are tied up from any proceedings in any cases of that nature by the act of toleration. Because I think there is nothing more certain than what bishop Stillingfleet says<sup>c</sup>; 'However the church in some

<sup>c</sup> Answer to N.O. § 15, p. 267. [See 'Answer to several treatises occasioned by a book, entitled "A Discourse concern-

ing the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome.'" 8°. London, 1673: again, 1674: or, in Stillingfleet's Works, fol. vol. v.]

‘ respects be incorporated with the commonwealth in a Christian state, yet its fundamental rights remain distinct from it: of which this is one of the chief, to receive into and exclude out of the Church such persons which, according to the laws of a Christian society, are fit to be taken in or shut out.’ It is temporal punishments only which those temporal laws design to set aside. Yet this I will say; that by the general forbearance that is now used, it is ten to one whether such a person would be presented. But we will put the hardest of the case, and suppose him to be presented.

He is then warned to appear before the bishop at the church-court. He pleads, we will suppose, conscience for his doing or refusing the things mentioned. The bishop exhorts him, shews him reasons, endeavours to satisfy his doubts, &c., or perhaps deputed some persons to discourse at leisure more largely with him concerning them. If by these means the man be satisfied, all is well. But we must put the case that he be not. Here the question is, whether the bishop in such a case will proceed to excommunication, or use a forbearance. I suppose he will make a difference of the tempers of men. If such a man do shew a temper heady, fierce, obstinate, self-opinionated, and self-willed; and a contempt of the court, and of all that is said to him; he is hardly a fit member of any church. But if there appear the signs of a meek, humble, and Christian disposition, willing to hear and consider the reasons and advices given; such a case deserves the greater forbearance. And though the law requires three several admonitions, yet it does not, I suppose, limit the bishop to three, nor to any number. And if this forbearance continue long, the man’s children will be grown up, so as to be baptized, as he would have them, upon their own profession. And if he desire, or be but willing, that it be done by dipping; the church does comply with his desire, and does advise it in the first place. And so the dispute will be over. If the bishop do excommunicate him before he be convinced, or this be done, then indeed I have no more to say on this head: there is a full stop put to the proposal. But there are these reasons to think that it would not be so:

First, I never heard of that done: but several times the contrary. All the antipædobaptists, or indeed other dissenters, that I have known excommunicated, have been excommunicated, not for their opinion, but their refusal of communion, or for contempt in refusing to come at all to the bishop’s court.

2. Mr. Tombes (and several others, but I will name only him,



because his case is generally known) continued in communion in the church of Salisbury all the latter part of his life. And though he during that time owned his opinion, and wrote for it, yet because he desired to make no schism of it, he was not disturbed in his communicating with the church. Nor has that church ever been blamed for receiving him. On the contrary, the example has been spoken of with commendation in a very public way. This shews it to be practicable: and if it be so; then,

Thirdly, There is a great and manifest advantage in it. For it prevents a schism, which otherwise would be. The man continuing in communion, all things will tend to an accommodation: whereas in a separation every thing is aggravated to the widening of the gap, as we see by constant and woful experience. A separate party never thinks itself far enough off from any terms of reconciliation.

The second difficulty, which concerns, as I said, both the bishop and the curate, is this. By the order of the church of England, no person is to be admitted to partake of the holy communion till he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed. And a qualification required of every person before he be brought to the bishop to be confirmed is, that he have learned (or, as it is expressed in another place, can answer to) the questions of the Catechism. Now in that Catechism there happens to be a mention of infants being baptized. For after that it has declared that baptism is to be given upon a covenant of faith and repentance, it follows; '*Qu.* Why then are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them? *Ans.* Because they promise them both by their sureties: which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform.' Now this man being asked that question would not make that answer: but would say, they ought not to be baptized till they can perform them.

But besides, that one may answer here (much as in the other case) that the practice is such, that not half the people that come to the communion are asked whether they have been confirmed or not: and also, that those who come to be confirmed when they are of the age of a man are seldom or never examined in the questions of the Catechism, provided it does by other ways sufficiently appear that they do understand the principles of religion; the questions as they stand in the Catechism being seldom put but only to children. Besides this, I say, it appears to have been the meaning of the Church in that question and answer, not to determine this point, whether infants are to be baptized (of which no Englishman at that time made any doubt): but to determine this point; whether

infants that are baptized are baptized upon any other covenant than that upon which grown persons are baptized, viz. of repentance and faith. And it determines that they are not baptized on any other, but the very same: only with this difference; that an adult person is baptized into the hopes of the kingdom of heaven, inasmuch as he does believe; and an infant is baptized into the same, on condition that he do, when he comes to age, believe. And this indeed is a principle very necessary to be rightly understood. For a mistake herein might hinder those who are baptized in infancy from understanding the obligation that lies on them to faith and obedience, as ever they hope to partake of the kingdom of heaven: to prevent which mistake this clause of the Catechism seems to have been inserted. So that though the Church do here suppose indeed, or take it for granted, that infants are generally baptized; yet that is not the thing which she here defines: not that they are to be baptized; but *why* (or upon what terms) they are baptized. And this is a thing which an antipædobaptist holds as firmly as any man; that all baptism is to be upon this covenant. And he will readily assent to this; that supposing or taking it for granted that infants were to be baptized, they must be understood to be baptized on that covenant, viz. to enjoy the kingdom of heaven, on condition they do, when they come to age, perform the duties of faith and repentance.

And since this is the substance of what the Catechism there teaches, and the Catechism was intended, not to determine controversies, but to teach fundamental principles; I believe that the bishops would not refuse to confirm such a person, (otherwise sound in the faith and conformable, and desirous of communion,) though he should own his sense in his answer to that question of the Catechism. This I think; but I end this discourse, wherein the authority of the church is concerned, as I began it; viz. in submitting my opinion to theirs, and leaving it to themselves to determine whether they would or not, or ought or not.

There are on the antipædobaptist's part, concerning his acceptance of communion with the Church, these two difficulties:

Some men of that way do think, that all such as have no other baptism but what was given in infancy and by affusion, are no Christians; and that to bid them hold communion with such, is as much as to bid them hold it with heathens. I hope there are not many such: and Mr. Stennet reckons it a slander on the antipædobaptists. And I am glad to find by his discourse that he is cordial in the abhorrence of so unchristian a notion. And therefore I shall say the less of it; having a natural antipathy against talking with

any one whose principles are so desperately uncharitable as this comes to. What I said before, § 6, to shew that this difference about the age or manner of receiving baptism is not a fundamental one, is applicable here. Let a man that has this thought first read that, and then let him consider further, what becomes of the church of Christ at this rate. Will he think that Christ has had no church but in those few times and places where this opinion has prevailed? Peter of Clugny (whom I quoted part ii. ch. 7. § 5.) urges the Petrobrusians with this dreadful consequence five or six hundred years ago, that if infant-baptism be not valid, there had been never a Christian in Europe for three or five hundred years before: and that account is much increased now.

The sophisters in logic have a way by which, if a man do hold any the least error in philosophy, they will by a long train of consequences prove that he denies the first maxims of common sense. And some would bring that spiteful art into religion; whereby they will prove him that is mistaken in any the least point, to be that antichrist who denies the Father and the Son. If the pædobaptist be mistaken, or the antipædobaptist be mistaken; yet let them not make heathens of one another. The denial of the Quakers to be Christians, those of them I mean that do believe the Scriptures, has such a dreadful consequence with it; that one would not willingly admit it, (though they do deny all baptism,) because they do however profess that which is the chief thing signified and intended by baptism. But since both the parties we speak of now, do own the religion professed in baptism, and do also both use the outward sign; supposing that one side do err in the mode of it or the age of receiving it: to conclude thence that they are no Christians, is the property of one that knows not what spirit he is of. To receive baptism one's self in that way which one thinks the fittest, is one case: but it is another, and very different case, to judge all those to condemnation that have received it another way. *Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?* I know that the antipædobaptists do not admit to the Lord's Supper, when it is administered by themselves, any but what are baptized in their way. But I speak now of one that is to receive it, not to administer it: he that receives it has no charge on his soul of the way in which those that receive with him have been baptized. But I have said more than is, I hope, needful on this head.

The *Confession*, which I mentioned before, of one hundred churches of antipædobaptists, does not say, that only the adult are capable of baptism: it says but thus; 'they are the only proper subjects of



‘this ordinance<sup>d</sup> ;’ and they do not say, that immersion is necessary to the administration ; but ‘that it is necessary to the *due* administration of it.’ I mentioned at ch. v. § 6 how the Christians of Africa and of Europe differed as much as this comes to, in their opinion of the validity of baptism given by schismatics : insomuch that the Africans baptized anew any schismatic that came over to the church ; the Europeans did not so. But yet these churches did not break communion for this difference. A presbyter or bishop of Africa, coming to Rome, joined in communion ; though there must needs be, in the congregations there, several who, according to his notion of the due way of baptizing, were not duly baptized ; and whom he, if he had had the admitting of them into his own church in Africa, would have baptized anew. But he left this matter to the conscience and determination of the church of the place. And by this means of both parties’ continuing communion, the whole matter in which they differed was at last amicably adjusted, as I there shew. And whereas the conduct of Stephen of Rome, who would have made a breach of this, has been since blamed by all the Christians, as well of Rome as of other places ; the conduct of Cyprian of Africa, who gave his determination of the question with this additional clause<sup>e</sup>, [neminem judicantes, aut a jure communionis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes : ‘not judging any one, nor refusing communion with him, though he be of the other opinion],’ has been since applauded by all Christians in the world, as a saying worthy of so excellent a martyr of Jesus Christ, and a precedent fit to be observed in the determination of all questions that are not fundamental.

The other difficulty is, that if such a man do come to join in the prayers of the Church of England : if there be an infant brought to be baptized in the time of the public service, he cannot join in the prayers used in that office : or, at least, not in all of them.

This must be confessed, while he holds that opinion. But I shewed before, at § 4, that this ought not to hinder his joining in the other prayers : so that paragraph may serve for answer to this. He may, when the people are kneeling at those prayers, stand up, or sit and read in his Bible. There were in king William’s time some, that, not being satisfied about his title, thought they ought not join in, or say *Amen* to, some of those prayers wherein he was named. However they were blamed by the state for not agreeing

<sup>d</sup> Chap. 29. [See above, p. 555, 675.]

<sup>e</sup> Prologium Sti Cypriani in Concil. Carthag. [See the first and last sentences of the piece, entitled ‘Sententia Episco-

porum lxxxvii. de Hæreticis Baptizandis,’ in St. Cyprian’s works, p. 229. edit. Fell. p. 329. edit. Benedict.]

in those: they were never blamed by the church for continuing to join in the rest.

What I have said of the antipædobaptists does plainly reach to the case of several other dissenters. And that with greater force of the argument, because they differ less from the church in opinions.

One thing I am persuaded of concerning the antipædobaptists; and that is, that if they were convinced that this joining in the public service of the Church were lawful and practicable for them, they would join at another rate than some shifting people do nowadays. I take them generally to be cordial, open, and frank expressers of their sentiments. If they thought that St. Paul's command of 'receiving one another' did reach to this case that I have been speaking of, (as I think it does,) they would not interpret it trickishly, as some lawyers do a statute in which they seek a flaw and an evasion: to lurk behind the words of it, while they defeat the true meaning. They would conclude, that what God commands us to do, he means we should do cordially, sincerely, and *bona fide*; and not to deal with his word as a Jesuit does with an oath. And therefore that if his word do bid us receive one another, he means we should do it entirely.

There is one entreaty that I would use to them; which is, that if they be at all moved to consider of such joining, and to deliberate whether it be lawful, or be a duty, or not, they would make a good and prudent choice of the men whose advice they ask about it. There are some men among all parties (I hope it is not many) that do promote divisions out of interest. These, as St. Paul says, *serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly*. They consider if the schism should drop, what would become of that esteem, credit, applause, admiration, gain, &c., which they get by heading and leading of parties: they must then be but as common Christians, walking even with the rest in a beaten road, and all the glory of setting up new ways would be lost. These are not fit for any pious and sincere man to trust with the direction of his conscience; nor likely to give a true verdict. On the contrary, they are the cause of most of the divisions which Christ has forbidden. He says that offences [or scandals] must come: and St. Paul says, *there must be heresies* [or divisions]. We may say of both, *Woe be to the men by whom they come*. The civil law has, I think, a rule, that when any great mischief appears to be spread among the people, and it is not known who were the authors that first set it on foot, it should be inquired, *Cui bono fuit?* Who are the men that are likely to get any advantage by it? and to suspect them. These that promote division

for interest, keep their consciences, as beggars do their sores, raw and open on purpose, and would not have them healed for any money. Let not any honest man trust them with the keeping of his. But apply to a man who (of which opinion soever he be) is cordial, sincere, and has no interest in the advice he gives.

I shall conclude with the words of St. Paul, which I have made, as it were, the text of this sermon: *Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us.* Christ received us, when we were not only silly, mistaken, erroneous, but sinful too. He received us, that he might make us wiser and better. St. Paul adds; *to the glory of God*: meaning, that God is no way more dishonoured than by our divisions, nor any ways more glorified than by our unity and receiving one another.

The whole context is thus, Rom. xv. 5, 6, 7:

*Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like minded [i. e. unanimous] one toward another according to Christ Jesus: that ye may with one mind and one mouth [i. e. unanimously] glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore [or to which purpose that you may so do] receive ye one another, [though differing in opinion,] as Christ also received us, to the glory of God. Amen.*



## AN ALPHABETICAL TABLE

### OF SOME FEW MATTERS.

---

#### *Antipædobaptism.*

St. AUSTIN (year after the apostles 317) disputing for the doctrine of original sin, and Pelagius against it, do both agree that no Christian (catholic or sectary) that either of them had read or heard of, was an antipædobaptist; p. 237, 302. The opinion of antipædobaptism not a sufficient cause of separation; ch. *ult.*

#### *Baptism*

Given by the Jews to proselytes, and their infant children; Introduction. Given by the Christians generally by dipping; p. 570: but by affusion in case of weakness, &c.; p. 571. Other washings beside dipping are in Scripture called *baptism*, or the baptizing of a man; p. 536.

#### *Bishops.*

The Christians of Irenæus' time [anno 180] were able to reckon up those that were placed bishops by the apostles in the several churches, and their successors to that time; p. 36, 605. Valentinian the emperor said, It was a thing too great for him to undertake, to nominate a bishop; p. 392. They were wont in the primitive church to be chosen by the clergy and people of the diocese; p. 571.

#### *Councils.*

Infant-baptism not instituted or enacted in any council; but in all that speak of it, is supposed or taken for granted as a Christian doctrine known before; p. 85, 162. One of the earliest councils since the apostles' time speaks of it; p. 78. The councils of Carthage and Milevis, [anno 416,] and that of Carthage, [anno 418,] do not enact that infants must be baptized, (that being a known thing before,) but that baptism is in them for *remission of sin*; p. 263, &c., 290, &c., 347, 348.

#### *Dipping Infants in the Font.*

The general use formerly; p. 570. When left off in the several countries of Europe; p. 576—584. Still used in all countries, hot or cold, except such where the Pope's power does or did prevail; p. 588, 589.

*Godfathers in Baptism.*

Used by the Jews at the circumcision of their children, and at the baptism of an infant proselyte, or disciple; Introduction. Mentioned as used by the Christians in the baptism of infants within one hundred years after the apostles, and all along afterward; p. 58. The answer that they made in the name of the child; p. 162, 322, &c.; 603, &c. The parents commonly were the godfathers; p. 165, 170.

*Infants.*

Whether baptized or not in the apostles' time, could not be unknown to the Christians that were ancient men one hundred or one hundred and fifty years after the said time; Preface. In what sense said to be regenerated by the Holy Spirit; p. 173, 175. The ancients did not think that infants have faith; p. 172, 174, 175. Not baptized in houses but in cases of the utmost extremity; p. 188. Dying unbaptized thought by the ancients to miss of heaven, but yet to be under no punishment, or a very mild one; p. 452—467. Dying after baptism, and before actual sin, agreed by all the Christian world to be saved; p. 471, &c. If offered by their parents or owners to baptism, ought to be baptized, of whatsoever parents born; p. 473, 474, &c.

*Polygamy*

Forbidden in the New Testament; p. 96.

*Regeneration or being born again.*

The word *regeneration*, *regenerated*, &c., never used by the ancients but when they speak of baptism; p. 443, 639.

*Rebellion.*

St. Ambrose concludes that Maximus and Eugenius are in hell, for their rebellions, though against a tyrannous and heretical emperor; p. 373.

*Schism.*

The penance for it to last ten years; p. 93.

*Sects.*

No sect before the year 1100, that allowed any baptism at all, denied it to infants; p. 307—318.

*Socinians*

Endeavour to bring into disrepute all the ancient Christians, and their writings; p. 421, 422; argue against the doctrine of the Trinity, not in a serious, but in a mocking way; p. 556.

*Some Texts of Scripture explained by the Ancients.*

Rom. v. 12. ....	p. 154.
1 Cor. vii. 1, 2. ....	p. 96.
1 Cor. vii. 14. ....	p. 113, 151, 239.
1 Cor. xv. 29. ....	p. 312.
Phil. ii. 7. ....	p. 609.
Col. ii. 11, 12. ....	p. 40.
Col. i. 15. ....	p. 609.
1 Tim. ii. 15. ..	p. 149.
1 Pet. iii. 19 ; iv. 6. ....	p. 32.
1 John iii. 3, 5. ....	p. 443.

*Amendments of Readings in the Fathers, which restore the Sense.*

August. de Natura et Gratia, c. 36. <i>quod lege quid</i> .....	p. 251.
August. de Gen. ad lit. lib. x. c. 23. <i>esset l. esse</i> .....	p. 179.
Concil. Carthag. iii. Can. 48. <i>ne l. an</i> .....	p. 192.
Gennadius, Catalog. <i>verbo</i> Pelagius, <i>eulogiarum l. eclogarum</i> ...	p. 269.
Hieronym. Epist. 153. <i>de monogamia l. de anima</i> .....	p. 213.
Hilarius de Synodis, prope finem, <i>invisibiliter l. indivisibiliter</i> ..	p. 441.
Wicklyff. Trialog. l. iv. c. 11. <i>baptizari l. baptizare</i> .....	p. 578.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES.

P. 410, <sup>2</sup>. The edition of 1542, as I find by a copy in the Cathedral Library of Chichester, leaves out the passage relating to the Church of Rome, and reads, ‘ the second, that ye geve Chrystendom to chyl dren.’

P. 412, <sup>1</sup>. *Mehrning*.] Walchius has taught me, that the book quoted under this title is a German version (by Jacob Mehrning) of a Dutch treatise, ‘ On the ‘ Vanity of Infant-baptism,’ composed by Hermannus Montanus.—*Mehrning*’s Version was published at Dortmund, in 1646, 1647.—It may be noticed, that a tract under the same title appeared in English in the year 1642, and was answered in 1644 by William Cooke.

P. 423<sup>e</sup>. It should have been noticed, that the tracts here cited, as well as that mentioned at p. 434, form a portion of that Collection which was published by the Unitarians, in 3 vols. 4<sup>o</sup>. in 1693, 1695, &c.

P. 565, line 9. By the kindness of the present Bishop of Rochester (1844,) I learn that the manuscript in question has *not* been restored to the repository from which it had been purloined; so that all hope of recovering it, after so long an absence, must now, I fear, be given up.







5577

W  
RTheol  
Wall, William  
The history of infant baptism. Vol. I.

University of Toronto  
Library

---

DO NOT  
REMOVE  
THE  
CARD  
FROM  
THIS  
POCKET

---





